



**Amendment to Indiana's
Consolidated State Plan
Under the Every Student Succeeds Act**



U.S. Department of Education
OMB Number: 1810-0576
Expiration Date: November 30, 2019

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Kelly Wittman Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff	Telephone: (317) 234-6904 (317) 233-6809
Mailing Address: 115 W. Washington Street, Suite 600 Indianapolis, IN 46204 Indiana Government Center North, 9 th Floor 100 N Senate Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46204	Email Address: kwittman@doe.in.gov bmurphy@doe.in.gov
<p>By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.</p>	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Superintendent Jennifer McCormick	Telephone: (317) 232-6610
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: September 18, 2017
Governor (Printed Name) Governor Eric Holcomb	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: August 15, 2017
Signature of Governor 	Date: September 18, 2017

The SEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to the enclosed assurances.

Table of Contents

Guide to Completing Revised Consolidated State Plan Template.....	6
Letter to Secretary DeVos.....	8
Introduction.....	9
Instruction for Completing the Consolidated State Plan.....	10
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan.....	11
Section 1: Long-term Goals.....	13
A. Academic Achievement.....	13
B. Graduation Rate.....	16
C. English Language Proficiency.....	18
Section 2: Consultation.....	20
A. Public Notice.....	20
B. Outreach and Input.....	21
C. Governor’s consultation.....	28
Section 3: Academic Assessments.....	29
A. Advanced Mathematics Coursework.....	29
B. Languages other than English.....	30
Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools.....	32
4.1 <i>Accountability System</i>	32
A. Indicators.....	32
B. Indicator Overview.....	32
C. Subgroups.....	42
D. Minimum Number of Students.....	44
E. Meaningful Differentiation.....	46
F. Participation Rate.....	49
4.2 <i>Identification of Schools</i>	51
A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.....	51
B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools.....	52
4.3 <i>State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools</i>	53
A. School Improvement Resources.....	53
B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions.....	56
C. More Rigorous Interventions.....	60
D. Periodic Resource Review.....	61
Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators.....	62
Introduction.....	62
Support Highlights.....	63
5.1 <i>Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement</i>	64
A. Certification and Licensure Systems.....	64
B. Educator Preparation Program Strategies.....	65
C. Educator Growth and Development Systems.....	68
5.2 <i>Support for Educators</i>	70
A. Resources to Support State-level strategies.....	70
B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs.....	75
5.3 <i>Educator Equity</i>	78
A. Definitions.....	78
B. Rates and Differences in Rates.....	79

C. Public Reporting.....	79
D. Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences.....	80
E. Identification of Strategies.....	81
F. Timelines and Interim Targets.....	82
Section 6: Supporting All Students.....	87
Introduction, Vision and Mission Statement.....	87
6.1 <i>Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students</i>	90
6.2 <i>Program-Specific Requirements</i>	110
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies.....	110
B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.....	110
C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.....	118
D. Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement.....	120
E. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants.....	124
F. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	126
G. Title V, Part B: Rural and Low-Income School Program.....	133
H. Title VII, Part B, Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act.....	134
Consolidated State Plan Assurances.....	144
Appendix Table of Contents.....	145
Appendix A: Measurements of Interim Progress.....	146
Appendix B: Notices of Public Meetings for ESSA Community Meetings.....	149
Appendix C: ESSA Community Meetings Findings Summary.....	158
Appendix D: Technical Assistance Working Group Members.....	162
Appendix E: Survey Stakeholder Feedback.....	164
Appendix F: Educator Equity Differences in Rates.....	168

Guide to Completing Revised Consolidated State Plan Template

In order to support State educational agencies (SEAs) to leverage their work developing a consolidated State plan, the U.S. Department of Education provides the following table as a guide to SEAs preparing to submit the Revised Consolidated State Plan Template published on March 13, 2017 under section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). An SEA may consider using its previously developed responses to requirements in the original November 29, 2016 template as a basis for responding to the requirements in the Revised Consolidated State Plan Template.

State Plan Requirements by Program	Statutory and Regulatory Requirements	Item(s) from Revised Template	Item(s) from Original Template	Page
Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)	Citation to ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and Part 200 regulations			
Eighth Grade Math Exception	1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR 200.5(b)	A.2.i-iii	3.A	29
Native Language Assessments	1111(b)(2)(F); 34 CFR 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4)	A.3.i-iv	3.B	30
Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (1111(c) and (d))				
Subgroups	1111(c)(2)	A.4.i.a-d	4.1.B	43
Minimum N-Size	1111(c)(3)	A.4.ii.a-e	4.1.C	44
Establishment of Long-Term Goals	1111(c)(4)(A)	A.4.iii.a-c	1.A-C	13
Indicators	1111(c)(4)(B)	A.4.iv.a-e	4.1.A	32
Annual Meaningful Differentiation	1111(c)(4)(C)	A.4.v.a-c	4.1.D; 4.1.G	46
Identification of Schools	1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) and (D); 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)	A.4.vi.a-g	4.2.A-B	51
Annual Measurement of Achievement	1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)	A.4.vii	4.1.E	49
Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement	1111(d)(3)	A.4.viii.a-f	4.2.A.ii; 4.2.B.iii; 4.3.B-D	51
Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators	1111(g)(1) (B)	A.5	5.3.B-C	79
School Conditions	1111(g)(1)(C)	A.6	6.1.C	107
School Transitions	1111(g)(1)(D)	A.7	6.1.A-B	90
Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children				
Supporting Needs of Migratory Children	1304(b)(1)	B.1.i-iv	6.2.B.ii –iii and vi	110
Promote Coordination of Services	1304(b)(3)	B.2	6.2.B.iv	113
Use of Funds	1304(b)(4)	B.3	6.2.B.viii	117
Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk				
Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs	1414(a)(1)(B)	C.1	6.2.C.i	118
Program Objectives and Outcomes	1414(a)(2)(A)	C.2	6.2.C.ii	119
Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction				
Use of Funds	2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)	D.1	5.2.A	70
Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools	2101(d)(2)(E)	D.2	5.2.A; 5.3.E	70; 78

State Plan Requirements by Program	Statutory and Regulatory Requirements	Item(s) from Revised Template	Item(s) from Original Template	Page
System of Certification and Licensing	2101(d)(2)(B)	D.3	5.1.A	64
Improving Skills of Educators	2101(d)(2)(J)	D.4	5.2.B	65
Data and Consultation	2101(d)(2)(K)	D.5	2.C-D	78
Teacher Preparation	2101(d)(2)(M)	D.6	5.1.B	65
Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement				
Entrance and Exit Procedures	3113(b)(2)	E.1	6.2.D.i	120
SEA Support for English Learner Progress	3113(b)(6)	E.2.i-ii	--	121
Monitoring and Technical Assistance	3113(b)(8)	E.3.i-ii	2.2.B and D	123
Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants				
Use of Funds	4103(c)(2)(A)	F.1	6.1.A-E	124
Awarding Subgrants	4103(c)(2)(B)	F.2	--	124
Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers				
Use of Funds	4203(a)(2)	G.1	6.2.E.i	127
Awarding Subgrants	4203(a)(4)	G.2	6.2.E.ii	130
Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program				
Outcomes and Objectives	5223(b)(1)	H.1	6.2.F.i	133
Technical Assistance	5223(b)(3)	H.2	2.2.D	133
Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B	McKinney-Vento Citation			
Student Identification	722(g)(1)(B)	I.1	6.2.G.i	134
Dispute Resolution	722(g)(1)(C)	I.2	6.2.G.iii	137
Support for School Personnel	722(g)(1)(D)	I.3	6.2.G.ii	135
Access to Services	722(g)(1)(F)(i)	I.4	6.2.G.v.1 and 2; 6.2.G.iv	138
Strategies to Address Other Problems	722(g)(1)(H)	I.5.i-v	6.2.G.vi	139
Policies to Remove Barriers	722(g)(1)(I)	I.6	6.2.G.vi	139
Assistance from Counselors	722(g)(1)(K)	I.7	--	142



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Jennifer McCormick
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Working Together for Student Success

September 18, 2017

Office of the United States Secretary of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Secretary DeVos:

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has worked over the past several months to involve stakeholders and practitioners in the development of its Consolidated ESSA State Plan, under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Meetings convened in every Congressional district and topical Technical Assistance Working Groups allowed constituents and experts, alike, to provide meaningful feedback to inform our plan and influence policies and practices relevant to Indiana's implementation of ESSA.

Throughout the drafting process, IDOE also worked to intentionally engage State policymakers at multiple points. Members of the State Board of Education and their staff provided significant contributions to the Assessments and Accountability sections of the plan. The governor's Director of Education Policy served as a member of IDOE's Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group and was provided drafts of ESSA sections for review prior to Indiana's June 30 public release date. Simultaneously, and throughout the entire planning process, close communication and routine meetings occurred between the IDOE Chief of Staff and the governor's Deputy Chief of Staff to ensure continuous involvement of Indiana officials at the highest level.

Following Indiana's public release date, the IDOE received invaluable comments and feedback regarding the plan's refinement. This process was conducted through survey feedback, town hall meetings and innumerable work group sessions. To share outcomes that evolved through these collaborative efforts and to further keep constituents apprised, statewide regional meetings were conducted by me and department leaders to overview key elements of the final plan prepared for submission to the U.S. Department of Education.

Today, we are pleased to submit for your review and approval Indiana's Consolidated State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act. It reflects the culmination of countless meetings to meaningfully involve stakeholders, the dedicated work efforts of staff and collaborative partners, and the reflective development of implementation strategies to effectively support all Hoosier students and the educators who serve them.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jennifer McCormick

Attachment: Indiana's Consolidated ESSA State Plan

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)¹, permits the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. The Secretary must establish, for each covered program under section 8302 of the ESEA, and additional programs designated by the Secretary, the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan.

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) encourages each State to think comprehensively about implementation of programs across the ESEA and to leverage funding to ensure a focus on equity and excellence for all students as it develops its consolidated State plan. Further, the Department aims to support collaboration and efficiency across multiple programs to help ensure that all children have significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and that each SEA works to close achievement gaps.²

The Department identified five overarching components and corresponding elements that integrate the included programs and that must be addressed by each SEA electing to submit a consolidated State plan. These components encourage each SEA to plan and implement included programs in a comprehensive way to support local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and all student group. Consistent with the Secretary's authority in 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d) to establish the date, time and manner for submission of the consolidated State plan, the Department has established this template for submitting the consolidated State plan. Within each component, each SEA is required to provide descriptions related to implementation of the programs the SEA includes in the consolidated State plan. The consolidated State plan template includes a section for each of the components, as well as a section for the long-term goals required under the statewide accountability system in section 1111(c)(4)(a) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a).

The sections are as follows:

1. Long-Term Goals
2. Consultation
3. Academic Assessments
4. Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
5. Supporting Excellent Educators
6. Supporting All Students

When developing its consolidated State plan, the Department encourages each SEA to reflect on its overall vision and how the different sections of the consolidated State plan work together to create one comprehensive approach to improving outcomes for all students. The Department encourages each SEA to consider: (1) what is the SEA's vision with regard to its education system; (2) how does this plan help drive toward that vision; and (3) how will the SEA evaluate its effectiveness on an ongoing basis? =

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

² In developing its consolidated State plan, each SEA must meet the requirements section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and describe the steps it will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

Instruction for Completing the Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all required elements of the consolidated State plan. Although the information an SEA provides for each requirement will reflect that particular requirement, an SEA is encouraged to consider whether particular descriptions or strategies meet multiple requirements or goals. In developing its consolidated State plan, an SEA should consider all requirements to ensure that it develops a comprehensive and coherent consolidated State plan.

Submission Procedures

Each SEA must submit to the Department its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017;** or
- **September 18, 2017.**

The Department will not review plans on a rolling basis; consequently, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(ii), a consolidated State plan or an individual program State plan that addresses all of the required components received:

- On or prior to April 3, 2017 is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on April 3, 2017.
- Between April 4 and September 18, 2017 is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on September 18, 2017.

Each SEA must submit either a consolidated State plan or individual program State plans for all included programs that meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements in a single submission by one of the above deadlines.

The Department will provide additional information regarding the manner of submission (e.g., paper or electronic) at a later date consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(i).

Publication of State Plan

After the Secretary approves a consolidated State plan or an individual program State plan, an SEA must publish its approved plan(s) on the SEA's Web site in a format and language, to the extent practicable, that the public can access and understand in compliance with the requirements under 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3).

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS.[State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and still wishes to receive funds under that program or programs, it must submit individual program plans that meet all statutory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(iii).

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.
or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below for which the SEA is submitting an individual program State plan:

- ☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies
- ☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- ☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- ☐ Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English learners and Immigrant Students
- ☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- ☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- ☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- ☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act): Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

Educator Equity Extension

☐ Check this box if the SEA is requesting an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3). An SEA that receives this extension must calculate and report in this consolidated State plan the differences in rates based on school-level data for each of the groups listed in section 5.3.B and describe how the SEA will eliminate any differences in rates based on the school-level data consistent with section 5.3.E. An SEA that requests this extension must also provide a detailed plan and timeline in Appendix C addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level.

☒ Check this box if the State has developed an alternative template, consistent with the March 13 letter from Secretary DeVos to chief state school officers.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included a Cover Sheet with its Consolidated State Plan.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included a table of contents or guide that indicates where the SEA addressed each requirement within the U.S. Department of Education’s Revised State Template for the Consolidated Plan, issued March 2017.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has worked through the Council of Chief State School Officers in developing its own template.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act. See Appendix D.

Section 1: Long-term Goals

Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the State's minimum number of students.

In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.

A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is dedicated to decreasing the student achievement gap across all student groups. While student assessment data cannot measure the myriad of learning and growth occurring in classrooms, student academic achievement correlates with student preparedness for life after PK-12 education. With this in mind, Indiana has set the following ambitious, yet achievable goal for our state:

Indiana will close its student achievement gap in English/language arts and mathematics for all student groups by 50 percent by 2023 for high school and by 2026 for elementary and middle school.

The student achievement gap reduction is calculated by first identifying the 2018-2019 baseline student performance on statewide assessments by student group (percentage proficient); subtracting that percentage from 100 percent; dividing the result by 50 percent, which represents the gap closure; and adding that percentage to the baseline to identify the long-term goal. For example:

Student Achievement Gap Calculation Example

Student Group: All Students (English/language arts (ELA) for grades 3-8)

Step 1: 2018-2019 Baseline Proficiency = 47.9%

Step 2: $100\% - 47.9\% = 52.1\%$

Step 3: Reduction goal is 50% of 52.1% = 26.1

Step 4: Add reduction goal to baseline proficiency to determine long-term goal (increase in proficiency) for the All Students group $26.1 + 47.9 = 74.0$

The long-term goal for the All Students group is 74.0% by 2025-2026.

Rationale

In looking at the 2018-2019 baseline academic achievement data for student groups, it is clear that Indiana students are at different points of proficiency. Therefore, setting a common proficiency endpoint (e.g. all student groups will be at 85 percent proficiency by 2023) does a disservice to both struggling students and high achieving students alike. Such a goal would be ambitious, but likely not achievable over a medium-term time horizon.

Instead, Indiana chose to set a common goal of closing the academic achievement gap by 50 percent by 2023. This is an ambitious goal, as Indiana will need to realize double digit increases for every student group over the next four years. It is an achievable goal because the increase for academic achievement is based on the starting point for each student group.

This approach establishes the same long-term timeframe for all student groups, establishes proficiency targets based on the current performance of each student group, and expects larger improvements in the same timeframe from student groups with lower baseline proficiency rates. State progress toward achieving its long-term goals will be monitored by checking actual achievement against the measurements of interim progress at regular intervals.

When considering previous years of student assessment data, it is clear that many student groups will have to grow at larger intervals year over year than ever before to achieve a 50 percent achievement gap closure by 2023. Since 2010, the maximum amount African-American students have grown as a student group is 2.19 percent.³

During Indiana's 2017 legislative session, IC 20-32-5.1 *et seq.* was added to the Indiana Code to establish Indiana's Learning Evaluation Assessment Readiness Network Program (ILEARN). The purpose of the ILEARN program is to establish an assessment that is student centered and provides meaningful and timeline information to all stakeholders on both a student's grade proficiency level and the student's growth toward Indiana's college and career readiness standards. Additionally, the ILEARN program must help students understand their college and career readiness and hold schools accountable for preparing students for college and careers.

The new statewide assessment was first administered for grades 3 through 8 during the 2018-2019 school year. For the first time, Indiana's statewide assessment for elementary and middle schools was computer adaptive and administered during one test window. Given this shift to computer adaptive administration, performance tasks were able to measure some constructs that were not able to be measured previously, or not able to be measured with much accuracy.

The new assessment aligns to Indiana Academic Standards, which represent longitudinal content progressions to prepare students for college and career readiness. The assessment reports a College and Career Indicator at each grade based on the trajectory of content expectations leading into high school performance. Further, the proficiency level thresholds were established to align with national norms with similar academic standard frameworks, in addition to performance on College Entrance Exams, and with consideration of current high school proficiency.

Given all of these factors, Indiana saw a decline in its proficiency rates for English/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8. Due to the higher level of rigor behind the proficiency standards and thresholds of the new assessment, Indiana is resetting its long-term goals baseline year to ensure progress is being measured based on the more rigorous expectations associated with the new assessment. While the long-term goals are lower than they were initially, they are still ambitious because of the alignment to the more rigorous proficiency expectations of the new assessment.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

³ see Appendix A

Grades 3-8 Academic Achievement Long-term Goals

Student Group	English/Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency			
	Baseline (%)	Year	Goal (%)	Year		Baseline (%)	Year	Goal (%)	Year
All Students	47.9	2019	74.0	2026		47.8	2019	73.9	2026
American Indian	44.0	2019	72.0	2026		42.9	2019	71.5	2026
Asian	63.8	2019	81.9	2026		67.9	2019	84.0	2026
Black	24.7	2019	62.4	2026		22.5	2019	61.3	2026
Hispanic	35.5	2019	66.8	2026		34.4	2019	67.2	2026
Multiracial	43.3	2019	71.7	2026		41.7	2019	70.9	2026
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	42.4	2019	71.2	2026		46.1	2019	73.1	2026
White	54.2	2019	77.1	2026		54.6	2019	77.3	2026
Special Education	15.7	2019	57.9	2026		19.3	2019	59.7	2026
English Learners ⁴	16.3	2019	58.2	2026		23.5	2019	61.8	2026
Free/Reduced Price Meal	33.5	2019	66.8	2026		33.4	2019	66.7	2026

Grade 10 Academic Achievement Long-term Goals⁵

Student Group	English/Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency			
	Baseline (%)	Year	Goal (%)	Year		Baseline (%)	Year	Goal (%)	Year
All Students	59.2	2016	79.6	2023		34.7	2016	67.3	2023
American Indian	58.4	2016	79.2	2023		28.4	2016	64.2	2023
Asian	67.4	2016	83.7	2023		59.2	2016	79.6	2023

⁴ English learner goals are set by looking at students currently enrolled as English learners as well as students who were reclassified as fluent English proficient within the last 4 years “(i.e, former English learners)”

⁵ Measurements of interim progress can be found in appendix A

Black	36.7	2016	68.4	2023		13.4	2016	56.7	2023
Hispanic	46.7	2016	73.3	2023		21.6	2016	60.8	2023
Multiracial	56.9	2016	78.5	2023		29.8	2016	64.9	2023
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	50.0	2016	75.0	2023		23.4	2016	61.7	2023
White	63.9	2016	82.0	2023		39.0	2016	69.5	2023
Special Education	16.9	2016	58.5	2023		7.8	2016	53.9	2023
English learners ⁶	45.7	2016	72.9	2023		26.7	2016	63.4	2023
Free/Reduced Price Meal	43.9	2016	71.9	2023		19.7	2016	59.8	2023

B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

The IDOE believes that all students should finish their PK-12 education prepared to embark on their chosen path in life. While the receipt of a high school diploma is not the only way to measure student success in high school, it is an important achievement on a student's path to a successful life. With this in mind, Indiana has chosen to set the following ambitious, yet achievable goal for our state:

Indiana will close its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate gap for all student groups by 50 percent by the 2022 cohort.

The graduation rate gap reduction is calculated by first identifying the 2018 baseline graduation rate by student group; subtracting that percentage from 100 percent; dividing the result by 50 percent, which represents the gap closure; and adding that percentage to the baseline to identify the long-term goal. For example:

Graduation Rate Gap Calculation Example

Student Group: All Students

Step 1: 2018 Baseline Graduation rate calculation = 87.1%

Step 2: $100\% - 87.1\% = 12.9\%$

Step 3: Reduction goal is 50% of 12.9% = 6.5%

Step 4: Add reduction goal to baseline proficiency to determine long-term goal (increase the graduation rate) for the All Students group $6.5\% + 87.1\% = 93.6\%$

The long-term graduation rate goal for all students is to 93.6 percent by the 2022 cohort.

⁶ English learner goals are set by looking at students currently enrolled as English learners as well as students who were reclassified as fluent English proficient within the last 4 years "(i.e., former English learners)"

Rationale

In looking at the 2018 calculation of the graduation rate for student groups, it is clear that there are differences among Indiana students. Therefore, setting a common graduation rate goal (e.g. all student groups will be at 95 percent of students graduated by the 2022 cohort) does a disservice to both struggling students and high achieving students alike. Such a goal would be ambitious, but likely not achievable over a medium-term time horizon.

Instead, Indiana chose to set a common goal of closing the graduation rate gap by 50 percent by the 2022 cohort. We believe this goal is ambitious, especially given the new graduation rate calculation requirement provided by the U.S. Department of Education. We believe that this goal is also achievable, because the amount of graduation rate increase is based on the student group's own data.

Our approach establishes the same long-term timeframe for all student groups, establishes rate targets based on the current performance of each student group, and expects larger improvements in the same timeframe from student groups with lower baseline graduation rates. State progress toward achieving its long-term goals will be monitored by checking the actual graduation rate against the measurements of interim progress at regular intervals.⁷

Please note: Indiana has adopted a new statewide assessment, starting in the 2018-2019 school year. Along with that assessment change, the requirements for graduation have been changed to align with new federal expectations. As such, graduation rate goals been updated to set the baseline with the 2018 cohort.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.

Graduation Rate Goals by Student Group ⁸				
Student Group	Graduation Rate			
	Baseline (%)	Year ⁹	Goal (%)	Year
All Students	87.1	2018 cohort	93.6	2022 cohort
American Indian	82.4	2018 cohort	91.2	2022 cohort
Asian	94.8	2018 cohort	97.4	2022 cohort
Black	78.1	2018 cohort	89.1	2022 cohort
Hispanic	83.2	2018 cohort	91.6	2022 cohort
Multiracial	83.9	2018 cohort	92.0	2022 cohort
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	81.9	2018 cohort	91.0	2022 cohort

⁷ The State's measurements of interim progress may be found in Appendix A

⁸ Measurements of interim progress can be found in appendix A

⁹ Our baseline year graduation rate was calculated using the new guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, not the 2016 graduation rate used for State and Federal accountability purposes

White	89.4	2018 cohort	94.7	2022 cohort
Special Education	72.2	2018 cohort	86.4	2022 cohort
English Learners ¹⁰	67.7	2018 cohort	83.9	2022 cohort
Free/Reduced Price Meal	83.4	2018 cohort	91.7	2022 cohort

C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **Description.** Describe the State’s uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English learners in the State, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:
 1. How the State considers a student’s English language proficiency level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the State takes into account (*i.e.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).
 2. The applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum.
 3. How the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines.

More than 112,000 Indiana students speak a language other than English at home, and there are over 275 different languages represented in Indiana schools. Of these, over 50,000 students have been formally identified as English Learners (EL) due to limited proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing academic English. Indiana is committed to ensuring that all EL students are held to the same rigorous college and career ready academic standards as their native English-speaking peers.

Indiana has adopted WIDA ACCESS for ELs as the State’s annual English language proficiency assessment. A student’s overall composite proficiency level as determined by their first testing with the WIDA ACCESS for ELs assessment is considered their initial proficiency level upon enrollment in an Indiana EL program.

Indiana will use a growth-to-target model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. Each student will be assigned an annual growth target that is established based on the student’s proficiency level upon initial identification as an English learner, the student’s grade level, and the student’s age. Each year after the student’s initial identification and administration of the WIDA ACCESS 2.0, the student is expected to meet his or her annual growth toward English language proficiency as defined through the individualized growth targets. Additionally, a student who attains proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment will be considered to have achieved his or her annual growth target. The individual student growth target will be reset annually based on the student’s actual growth on WIDA ACCESS 2.0 to account for more rapid growth at lower levels of English proficiency and slower growth at higher levels of English proficiency, and to ensure that the target aligns with the State’s long-term goal of attaining proficiency within six years.

¹⁰ English learner goals are set by looking at students currently enrolled as English learners as well as students who were reclassified as fluent English proficient within the last 4 years “(i.e., former English learners)”

Indiana's goal is for 70.0 percent of English learners to attain English language proficiency within six years. The alignment of this goal with the English Language Proficiency indicator of the State's accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows schools to monitor this student group annually within the six-year timeline of the State's long-term goal.

The WIDA Consortium recently conducted a scoring standard setting for the WIDA ACCESS for ELs 2.0 assessment. Indiana has only administered the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment for two years, and therefore does not have longitudinal data to confidently and securely determine the statewide goal and timeline for the attainment of English language proficiency for its English learner population. As such, Indiana will revisit the 70.0 percent threshold and the six-year timeline as more years of data become available to ensure that the goal is sufficiently rigorous and achievable.

- ii. Describe how the SEA established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

As a result of the scoring changes made to WIDA ACCESS for the 2016-2017 administration, and the lack of longitudinal data within Indiana due to transitioning from the LAS Links assessment to WIDA ACCESS and then to WIDA ACCESS 2.0, Indiana has set its long-term goal based on previous statewide English proficiency data results and second language acquisition research regarding appropriate timelines for language acquisition. This research shows that the average timeline to acquire academic language proficiency in a second language ranges from five to seven years. Indiana utilized data from the first two administrations of the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment to identify the rate of students meeting annual growth targets toward proficiency or attaining English language proficiency. Based on the 2017-2018 data, 39.0 percent of English learners in grades one through twelve either met their annual growth target or attained English language proficiency. To determine the ultimate goal for attaining English language proficiency, Indiana looked to cut the rate of English learners not demonstrating the necessary growth or proficiency in half within six years. Half of this rate would be 30.5 percent.

Indiana's goal is for 70.0 percent of English learners to attain English language proficiency within six years. The alignment of this goal with the English language proficiency indicator of the State's accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows schools to monitor this student group annually within the six-year timeline of the State's long-term goal.

As indicated above, Indiana will use a growth-to-target model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior year to current year. The individual student growth target will be reset annually based on the student's actual growth on WIDA ACCESS to account for more rapid growth at lower levels of English proficiency and slower growth at higher levels of English proficiency, and to ensure that the target aligns with the state long-term goal of attaining proficiency within six years.

Student Group	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
English Learners	WIDA ACCESS 2015-2016: 26 percent of students attained English proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS assessment	Indiana's long-term goal is for 70.0 percent of English learner students to attain English language proficiency or demonstrate adequate growth toward English language proficiency by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Section 2: Consultation

2.1 Consultation

Instructions: Each SEA must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders in developing its consolidated State plan, consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13 (b) and 299.15 (a). The stakeholders must include the following individuals and entities and reflect the geographic diversity of the State:

- The Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor’s office;
- Members of the State legislature;
- Members of the State board of education, if applicable;
- LEAs, including LEAs in rural areas;
- Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;
- Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, and organizations representing such individuals;
- Charter school leaders, if applicable;
- Parents and families;
- Community-based organizations;
- Civil rights organizations, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students;
- Institutions of higher education (IHEs);
- Employers;
- Representatives of private school students;
- Early childhood educators and leaders; and
- The public.

Each SEA must meet the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3) to provide information that is:

1. Be in an understandable and uniform format;
2. Be, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and
3. Be, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12102, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.

- A. **Public Notice.** Provide evidence that the SEA met the public notice requirements, under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), relating to the SEA’s processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan.

Public notice for each ESSA community meeting was posted in compliance with Indiana’s “Open Door Law.”¹¹ An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper, circulated within the geographic area of each meeting, and the meeting notice was posted outside of the front door of the Indiana Department of Education’s (IDOE’s) offices. We also shared the meeting information with stakeholder groups including civil rights organizations, parent groups, the principals’ association, the teachers’ association, the superintendents’ association, and local community organizations. We partnered with our host organizations (including civil rights organizations, higher education institutions and local libraries) to recruit stakeholders from their communities.

Our meetings complied with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The IDOE provided ADA accessible meeting locations for each meeting and provided any needed accommodation, auxiliary aid or other services based on request from individuals in accordance with Title II of the ADA and 28 CFR Part 35.

¹¹ IC 5-14-1.5-1 et. seq.

B. Outreach and Input. For the components of the consolidated State plan including Challenging Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students, describe how the SEA:

- i. Conducted outreach to and solicited input from the individuals and entities listed above, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), during the design and development of the SEA's plans to implement the programs that the SEA has indicated it will include in its consolidated State plan; and following the completion of its initial consolidated State plan by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submitting the consolidated State plan to the Department for review and approval.

Community Meetings

From March through April 2017, the IDOE hosted nine community meetings across the state, one in every congressional district in Indiana. The goal was to engage families, teachers, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, principals, administrators, business and community leaders, members of civil rights organizations, institutions of higher education, and any other member of a given community who wanted to provide input in the development of the state plan.


The meetings were well publicized and designed to ensure working people had an opportunity to participate. Meetings were held in the evening in partnership with local community organizations including community centers, colleges and universities, civil rights organizations and libraries. In all, over 350 Hoosiers participated in the community meetings.

Below is a chart with dates, times, and locations of the community meetings:

Date	Location	District
March 16, 2017 7:30-9:00pm ET	Evansville Evansville-Vanderburgh Library - North Park Branch 960 Koehler Drive Evansville, IN 47710	8
March 29, 2017 7:30-9:00pm ET	Merrillville Merrillville Branch of the Lake County Public Library 1919 81st Avenue Merrillville, IN 46410	1
April 3, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Kokomo Indiana University Kokomo Kresge Auditorium 2300 S Washington Street Kokomo, IN 46902	5
April 4, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Indianapolis Indianapolis Urban League 777 Indiana Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46202	7
April 6, 2017 7:00-8:30pm ET	New Albany Griffin Recreation Center 1140 Griffin St. New Albany, IN 47150	9

April 11, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Goshen Goshen College Church-Chapel Building, South Entrance 1700 South Main Street Goshen, IN 46526	2
April 12, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Richmond Morrisson-Reeves Library 80 North 6th Street Richmond, IN 47374	6
April 19, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Lafayette Tippecanoe County Public Library 627 South Street Lafayette, IN 47901	4
April 20, 2017 6:30-8:00pm ET	Fort Wayne Fort Wayne Urban League 2135 Hanna Street Fort Wayne, IN 46803	3

Figure 1: Map of Community Meeting Locations



Meetings were structured to maximize public conversation. After a brief introduction from Superintendent Jennifer McCormick, or IDOE Chief of Staff Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, each participant moved into a small group to discuss one key issue in ESSA. Those groups were usually facilitated by a local teacher or community leader. Questions were designed to be accessible to any stakeholder, whether a participant worked in education or not. Participants chose one of the following key questions to consider and discuss:

- A. How can we determine how our schools are doing?
- B. How should we communicate how our schools are doing?
- C. How should we support ALL students?
- D. How can we improve our schools in need?

After discussing the question, each group nominated one person to share the list of recommendations to answer that specific question with the larger group. Those lists were compiled and used to support the drafting of sections of the Indiana ESSA plan.¹²

The IDOE was fortunate to have many state education policymakers on hand to listen to community stakeholders. Every member of the Indiana State Board of Education attended at least one ESSA meeting. Many attended multiple meetings, and one attended eight of the nine. Superintendent McCormick participated in seven of the nine community meetings personally, and required that each member of the IDOE cabinet participate in at least one. In many cases, local education leaders -- including superintendents and school board members -- participated in the highly-engaged discussion groups.

Technical Assistance Working Groups

To help advise the writing process on the technical elements of the ESSA plan, IDOE formed Technical Assistance Working Groups. Members included civil rights advocates, parents, teachers (including special educators), principals, administrators, community organization leaders, State Board of Education members and staff, members of the governor's staff, and experts in specific technical fields. The groups were led by the IDOE staff member responsible for the initial draft of each ESSA section. The working groups included the following subject areas:

1. Accountability
2. Assessments
3. Supporting all Students
4. Supporting Excellent Educators

The working groups met three times in the months of May and June. They met again in July to review the draft published on June 30 to offer additional, critical feedback.¹³

A full list of each group, including the members' name, role, and organization, may be found in Appendix D.

Individual and Other Meetings

To ensure that all stakeholders had genuine opportunities to participate, the IDOE also met with individual associations and advocacy groups upon request. IDOE staff met with groups including the Indiana State Teachers Association (ISTA), Teach Plus, the Indiana Arts Education Network, and the Indiana Library Federation.

State Superintendent Dr. Jennifer McCormick, along with other IDOE staff members working on Indiana's ESSA plan, participated in an ESSA question and answer session hosted by the Indianapolis Urban League on June 14. The meeting was attended by approximately 45 members of the Urban League community.

¹² A summary of the feedback can be found in Appendix C

¹³ The Assessment Technical Assistance Working Group met three times, not four

First Draft and Public Comment

On June 30, the IDOE published its first draft of the State ESSA Plan for public review. For each section, the IDOE provided online surveys to gather responses. Survey questions were developed by the ESSA section drafters in areas where more public feedback was deemed most crucial.¹⁴

INSBOE Working Sessions

The Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) received a full briefing on the first draft of the plan at public working sessions on July 12 and 13. Each section writer presented their portion of the State Plan to the INSBOE and discussed key challenges. Board members provided direct feedback for each section to help inform any adjustments deemed necessary.

Since the INSBOE has statutory authority over the state accountability system, much of the meeting focused on the accountability system. The IDOE and INSBOE staff jointly presented the recommendations developed by the Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group.¹⁵ To signal their support for the accountability provisions outlined in the ESSA plan, the INSBOE reached a consensus on key questions. The consensus reached in the ESSA plan reflects the INSBOE's support for the provisions in the ESSA plan, but the rulemaking process to amend the state accountability system is ongoing. The consensus was read into the board minutes by Superintendent McCormick at the INSBOE session on August 4.

Stakeholder Engagement on School Improvement

In the spring of 2017, the IDOE partnered with TNTP, a national non-profit organization that has supported leaders at the State, district and school levels for twenty years to help them achieve their goals for students. This partnership was formed in service of three specific priorities related to school improvement:

1. To develop a draft vision, guiding principles and a theory of action for supporting school improvement;
2. To gain in-depth feedback from a variety of stakeholders who engage from various inflection points with school improvement efforts on this vision, as well as the IDOE's approach to school improvement; and
3. To incorporate themes from stakeholders' feedback on school improvement into Indiana's ESSA plan.

These priorities were met through a three-part process that began (1) by engaging stakeholders within the IDOE to develop a draft strategic vision, guiding principles and theory of action for school improvement, (2) by gathering feedback on this vision for school improvement from a variety of external stakeholders, and (3) by synthesizing the feedback collected from external stakeholders to inform the core elements of the IDOE's school improvement model as defined in its ESSA plan.

After the IDOE developed a draft strategic vision and Theory of Action for school improvement, the IDOE and TNTP worked together to create and implement a stakeholder engagement plan to gain the perspectives of various stakeholders on this draft strategic vision and more broadly, the role of the IDOE in school improvement. In particular, TNTP collected feedback to provide the IDOE with a clear understanding of what stakeholders envision to be the highest leverage priorities for it as a State

¹⁴ Feedback from the stakeholders may be found in Appendix E

¹⁵ The membership of the Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group included IDOE and SBOE staff, three INSBOE members, and Governor Holcomb's Director of Education Policy. For full membership, please see appendix D

Education Agency to advance locally-driven school improvement efforts, as well as how they perceive the IDOE fulfilling these priorities. To do so, the IDOE and TNTP utilized one-on-one interviews and small focus groups to create conversational environments in which stakeholders had opportunities to provide detailed responses to questions. To capture the perspectives of stakeholders that engage with school improvement in a variety of ways, the IDOE and TNTP conducted 47 separate interviews or focus groups with a total of 62 individuals representing:

- Local Education Agencies (e.g., Superintendents, Principals, Teachers)
 - Community Partners;
 - Charter School Authorizers;
 - Elected State Officials;
 - Appointed State Officials (e.g., State Board of Education);
 - Staff in State Offices (e.g., Office of the Governor); and
 - Statewide Organizations (e.g., Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents).
- ii. Took into account the input obtained through consultation and public comment. The response must include both how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through consultation and public comment and any changes the SEA made as a result of consultation and public comment for all components of the consolidated State plan.

Throughout the month of July, the public had an opportunity to weigh in on the first draft of the State ESSA Plan through public surveys. The IDOE section drafters developed a set of questions in areas where they required additional public input. The public also had an opportunity to comment on any portion of the plan via the open-ended question at the end of the survey.

Public feedback was integral to some of the key choices made in Indiana’s plan. Some key themes evolving from stakeholder feedback are provided below.

Culture and Climate Surveys or Assessments

At community meetings and in Technical Assistance Working Groups, there was strong support for climate and culture surveys, either to support struggling schools or for use in accountability purposes. Parents, educators, community members at community meetings and policy experts on the Technical Assistance Working Groups widely agreed that while the elements of culture and climate are vital elements to school success, they can be challenging to measure.

Based on stakeholder feedback, the IDOE plans to begin a pilot of culture and climate surveys with struggling schools, with the goal of producing a refined survey proposal for statewide implementation. The Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group discussed the inclusion of a culture and climate survey or assessment in the current State Plan, but ultimately determined there was need for further study before adding it to an accountability system. The IDOE accepted their recommendation, with the provision that work efforts continue to pilot a survey with struggling schools – and ultimately finalize a climate/culture survey for statewide accountability use as soon as feasible.

Social and Emotional Supports

Another consistent theme heard at community meetings was the need for greater social and emotional supports of students. Stakeholders emphasized that the well-being of the whole child is essential for academic success.

Based on stakeholder feedback, IDOE will include social and emotional supports as a category choice for its Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants provided through Title IV, Part A in ESSA. Public LEAs and charter schools will have an opportunity to apply for these funds through a competitive grant process.

Supporting Teachers from Pre-Service through Induction

A clear theme emanating from the community meetings through the public survey was the need to support early-career Hoosier teachers. Seventy-eight percent of respondents to the public survey believed that new teachers needed more individualized support and mentorship from qualified teachers who understand the local context.¹⁶ Stakeholders who responded to the survey and participated in the community meetings specifically noted the need to provide additional support for teachers at the very beginning of their career. Parents testified at the August 2nd State Board of Education session as to the need to support strong partnerships between Education Preparation Providers (EPPs) and districts. Teachers in community meetings, as part of the Technical Assistance Working Groups, through the public surveys and through focus groups conducted by Teach Plus identified the support of early-career teachers as critical to strengthening their profession.


Based on stakeholder feedback, the IDOE will invest in early-career teachers in two major ways. First, the IDOE will develop tools to support districts and schools as they induct new teachers into their community. The Offices of Educator Effectiveness and School Improvement are collaborating with an LEA to build out the framework and supporting tools and resources that will be made available via the IDOE's website, virtual presentations, and multiple communications channels. Prioritization and tiers of support for implementation will be based on high-need schools' demonstration of educator experience gaps.

Impact of Stakeholder Engagement on School Improvement

Collectively, the insights shared by stakeholders led to six overarching recommendations for the IDOE as it works to enhance its approach to school improvement under ESSA. Figure 2 outlines these recommendations in an intentionally sequenced manner, with one specific, central suggestion at the core: Develop a vision-aligned, research-based, set of supports and expectations for school improvement.

¹⁶ See Appendix E

Figure 2: Roadmap of Overarching Stakeholder Recommendations for the IDOE's School Improvement Model



These recommendations highlight the most prominently surfaced insights from stakeholders regarding how the IDOE's school improvement model can best support locally-driven school improvement efforts. In many respects, these recommendations are illustrative of the conditions that the IDOE needs to put in place in order for the constitutive elements of its school improvement model to be effective. In particular, stakeholders stressed the importance of (1) grounding the IDOE's approach in a vision and research-based set of expectations and supports, (2) ensuring the IDOE has the necessary internal capacity (e.g., systems, personnel, partnerships) to fulfill its school improvement approach, and (3) continuously reflecting on and refining its model to improve its approach to school improvement. Taken together, these recommendations from stakeholders are viewed by the IDOE as a critical roadmap for guiding the Department's efforts in the 2017-2018 school year for codifying its school improvement model through clear, two-way communication with the field, strategic internal staffing and training, and ongoing data-driven reflection to continuously enhance the IDOE's school improvement model.

In addition to these overarching recommendations serving as a roadmap for the IDOE's ongoing efforts to strengthen our school improvement model, stakeholder feedback shaped numerous other school improvement components of Indiana's ESSA plan. For example, the vision, guiding principles and theory of action for school improvement in this plan are an outgrowth of feedback themes from stakeholders. The vision and guiding principles were merged into one aligned graphic to clearly show how (i.e., guiding principles) the IDOE will approach supporting locally-driven school improvement efforts to fulfill its related vision. Additionally, the theory of action was also refined to reflect how stakeholders envision the IDOE being able to deliver supports for low-performing schools and their districts in a manner that aligns to its guiding principles.

Music, Arts, and Physical Education

The IDOE recognizes music, arts, and physical education not as luxuries in a child's education, but rather as important features of whole-child development from PK-12 to postsecondary education. These areas provide positive benefits to executive function, motor skills, language development, decision making, visual learning, inventiveness, cultural awareness, physical and mental well-being, and improved academic performance. These co-curricular and extracurricular activities improve the curriculum while increasing student engagement and motivation. Based on stakeholder feedback, the IDOE will permit the use of federal funding to support these areas, where allowable, and when based upon the needs assessment of the school or LEA.

- C. Governor's consultation.** Describe how the SEA consulted in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor consistent with section 8540 of the ESEA, including whether officials from the SEA and the Governor's office met during the development of this plan and prior to the submission of this plan.

Throughout the ESSA plan drafting process, IDOE worked to engage state policymakers at multiple points. At each stage of the drafting process, Governor Holcomb's Director of Education Policy served as a member of the Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group. The Director of Education Policy was provided drafts of ESSA sections to review prior to the June 30 public release date. IDOE's Chief of Staff met regularly with Governor Holcomb's Deputy Chief of Staff to provide him with regular updates.

Date SEA provided the plan to the Governor: The IDOE submitted the ESSA Plan to the Governor on August 15, 2017.

Check one:

- ☒ The Governor signed this consolidated State plan.
☐ The Governor did not sign this consolidated State plan.

Section 3: Academic Assessments

Instructions: As applicable, provide the information regarding a State's academic assessments in the text boxes below.

Beginning in 2018-2019, Indiana will transition to a new assessment system highlighted in House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1003, ILEARN. ILEARN is defined to be end-of-year summative assessments aligned to the Indiana Academic Standards measuring proficiency for English/Language Arts, mathematics and proficiency for social studies and science across years in the following content areas and grade levels:

- Computer adaptive English/language arts and mathematics – Grades 3-8;
- Computer adaptive or fixed-form science – Grades 4 and 6 and biology end-of-course assessment; and
- Computer adaptive assessments for English 10 and Algebra I end-of-course assessments, beginning in 2019-2020. Fixed-form ECAs may be proposed given a vendor's bank to support computer adaptive assessments.

Computer adaptive assessments ensure the distribution of content is presented to the students to refine their mastery of the academic content standards. Indiana believes this results in more usable data from the summative assessment to allow conversations between administrators, educators, parents and students to be more informed regarding differentiating content to best meet students' needs. This transition allows for the creation of new blueprints, item specifications and confirms alignment to a robust item bank for the computer adaptive delivery.

A. Advanced Mathematics Coursework. Does the State: 1) administer end-of-course mathematics assessments to high school students in order to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA; and 2) use the exception for students in eighth grade to take such assessments under section 1111(b)(2)(C) of the ESEA?

☒ Yes. If yes, describe the SEA's strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4).

Yes, the state will administer end-of-course assessments aligned to current Indiana Academic Standards in 2018-2019. The requested exception is sought to begin in 2018-2019 in consideration of the following factors subject to State Board approval:

- End-of-course assessments (ECAs) will be developed in 2017-2018 for delivery under ILEARN in 2018-2019. These assessments will be aligned to the content for the Algebra I Indiana Academic Standards. In late fall 2017, educators will convene to define areas of priority for the assessment, ultimately building the foundation for the blueprints and item specifications. Educator committees of 8-10 participants representative of student populations across the state will engage in this process. Once developed, the blueprints representing the reporting categories and points allocated across standards will be posted publicly to formalize the relationship of the content across instruction and assessment. Shortly thereafter, the specifications, which further define content-relevant vocabulary and sample assessment items, will also be posted publicly.
- The Indiana State Board of Education formalizes policy for all statewide assessments in Indiana. In 2018-2019, students will be offered the opportunity to take the Algebra I ECA following their completion of the course defined in current state statute. The State Board must approve the plan for assessments in 2018-2019 considering potential student accountability (if used as a graduation pathway under current discussion), state accountability based on current statute and fulfilling the state's ESSA plan requirements. If the State Board defines the ECAs for

middle school populations this fall, we would request the exception noted above. Further, the State Board must define the more rigorous assessment to be used if the exception is exercised.

Indiana allows local discretion when placing students into appropriate courses for more complex mathematical content. However, recent emphasis within the Indiana Department of Education focuses on the relationships between STEM coursework and the placement of students for career and college. ILEARN furthers this relationship through the integration of a career and college indicator, noting a student's readiness for a defined pathway as they consider opportunities following high school.

B. Languages other than English. Describe how the SEA is complying with the requirements in section 1111(b)(2)(F) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f) in languages other than English.

- i. Provide the SEA's definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4), and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

English learners in Indiana speak over 270 languages. Spanish speakers represent 71.2 percent of the language minority student population of Indiana, Burmese and Chin represent 6 percent, German and Pennsylvania Dutch represent 2.6 percent, Arabic 2.5 percent, Mandarin and Sichuanese 2 percent, and Punjabi and Vietnamese each at 1.2 percent. The state considers Spanish to be significant due to the fact it is spoken by a majority of the non-English speakers in the state. The state only considers Spanish to be significant due to the fact it is the 2nd most spoken language in the state.

The state must consider other languages present and determine significance as a metric for addressing distinct populations or LEAs. Indiana does have a concentration of refugee students in four LEAs who speak Burmese and Chin. However, Indiana will need to determine whether assessment in these languages represents the language most likely to yield accurate data considering the limited literacy skills of refugee students in their native languages. Due to its significance, both with the migrant student population and population of students born outside of the United States, ILEARN will assess Spanish as a minimum for content areas not compromised by the translation. Outside of the before mentioned four LEAs, Spanish is the predominant non-English language spoken across grade levels. Nearly 100% of Indiana's migrant students speak Spanish, and therefore, the Spanish version of the assessment will be appropriate for these students. Because Indiana has such a small number of Native American students (.2% of the overall student population), there is not a significant need for an assessment in their native languages.

- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Indiana must establish policies to ensure the assessment measures the intended content, considerate of content validity. ILEARN will be offered in Spanish for mathematics and science. Portions of English/language arts may be offered but will be reviewed in 2017-2018 to ensure the content being assessed is not compromised. In addition to direct translations, Indiana may consider the use of student supports, such as glossaries or translations, to further meet the needs of students speaking languages other than English and manage accommodations for students that may not be fluent in their native language. For 2017-2018, the Indiana Department of Education authorizes a list of word-to-word bilingual dictionaries for use on Indiana assessments for English Learners.

- iii. Indicate the languages other than English identified in B.i. above for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

ILEARN will assess in Spanish, as a minimum, for content areas not compromised by the translation.

- iv. Describe how the SEA will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population by providing:

- 1. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4);

The state expects ILEARN to be offered in Spanish as a minimum requirement. Through the request for proposal process in fall 2017, potential bidders may propose the licensure by the state of an existing item bank. Through a licensed item bank, Indiana may decide additional languages offered by the bidder may be utilized. Indiana anticipates translating items or offering student supports in up to four languages including Spanish beginning with the 2018-2019 school year. The IDOE recommends the following four languages: Burmese, Arabic, Mandarin Chinese and Vietnamese.

The administered language will be determined locally, considering student literacy in both their native language and English as well as language of instruction. The length of time and lapse of time receiving instruction in that language would be considered.

- 2. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

Indiana's ESSA work groups, which consisted of EL teachers, EL administrators, IDOE members and SBOE staff members. In addition we also consulted with community stakeholders and EL parents. They identified this as an area of need for newcomers who should be assessed in their native language to gather a true picture of their content area knowledge. The SEA has discussed this need with our state English Learner Director Leadership group and will collect feedback from parents and families through the Immigrant Welcome Center, migrant parent advisory councils, Burmese American Community Institute, and related stakeholders.

- 3. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

Indiana will incorporate the inclusion of assessments in Spanish in its request for proposals for content area assessments in English/Language Arts, mathematics, and science. Bilingual dictionaries and other language supports will also be available.

Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and

regulatory requirements.

4.1 Accountability System.

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with §§ 200.12-200.24, §299.17 and with section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include any documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

- A. **Indicators.** Describe the measure(s) included in each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in §200.14(c)-(e) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA for all students and separately for each subgroup of students used to meaningfully differentiate all public schools in the State. The description should include how each indicator is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State. For the School Quality or Student Success measure, the description must also address how the indicator is supported by research that performance or progress on such measures is likely to increase student achievement and graduation rates and aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools by demonstrating varied results across all schools in the State.

Indiana's Statewide Accountability System

The overall framework for Indiana's ESSA plan is based on six general themes: be student-centered; ensure equity; be transparent; ensure alignment; be actionable; and be focused. Indiana's statewide accountability system was developed within the framework of these themes, and also considered the following principles to produce a meaningful system of accountability:

Principle One: The accountability system should drive student achievement and measure the relative effectiveness of schools in a valid, reliable, comprehensible, and actionable manner. The accountability system should simultaneously identify contributors to high performance and areas of concern that need additional support and resources.

Indiana's accountability system provides schools actionable data and information about performance toward the achievement targets at the individual indicator level while also informing stakeholders and parents in a meaningful way of the school's performance. Indiana's accountability system assigns schools a status of either "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Approaches Expectations", or "Does Not Meet Expectations" for each indicator as well as for the school's overall summative rating. This terminology provides schools and stakeholders with an explicit gauge for the school's progress toward or achievement of the state's performance expectations. These statuses provide clear information about areas where a school may be excelling or may need to dedicate additional focus and resources to improve.

Principle Two: The accountability system should set achievement targets and goals that incentivize high performance and yield high student achievement, and move schools toward those performance targets.

Indiana's accountability system aligns to the goals of the Indiana Department of Education's strategic plan to close achievement gaps between student groups; increase overall literacy proficiency; provide greater access to quality STEM opportunities; and increase the number of college and career ready graduates. All indicators in the accountability system align to long-term goals defined in the strategic plan in order to measure school progress toward meeting these goals. These goals are set in an ambitious yet achievable manner that considers the current state of achievement in Indiana while also establishing the desired outcomes to ensure the provision of a quality education for Indiana's students.

Principle Three: The accountability system should focus attention on schools that need support in order to provide all students in the State with an equitable academic experience that contributes to postsecondary and workforce success.

Indiana’s accountability system identifies those lowest-performing schools in order to provide additional supports for advanced performance and accelerated success.

Indiana’s accountability system is based on seven indicators: academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rate, addressing chronic absenteeism, closing achievement gaps, strength of diploma, and English language proficiency progress. Each indicator within the system is built in a way that acknowledges the guiding principles of an accountability system outlined above.

- **Academic Achievement Indicator:** this indicator recognizes that proficiency demonstrates the work schools and students are doing toward achieving mastery of grade-level standards.
- **Academic Progress Indicator:** this indicator recognizes that growth demonstrates the work schools and students are doing to increase their mastery of grade-level standards; and acknowledges students who meet or exceed the expected annual improvement or growth toward proficiency while also identifying students that need additional assistance.
- **Graduation Rate Indicator:** this indicator recognizes that the capstone of the K-12 education experience is preparedness for postsecondary education or workforce entrance, as demonstrated through the attainment of a high school diploma, which includes the demonstration of college and career readiness.
- **Addressing Chronic Absenteeism:** this indicator recognizes the impact of the school environment on the social and academic cultivation of students. Further, this indicator considers student preparedness, as determined through the early warning indicator of chronic absenteeism.
- **Closing Achievement Gaps:** this indicator recognizes the importance of highlighting the lowest performing students by shining a light on the growth and progress of the lowest performing 25% of students that may get shrouded when only looking at the performance of the student body as a whole.
- **Strength of Diploma:** this indicator recognizes the importance of rigor at the high school level translating into success in the postsecondary environment.
- **English Language Proficiency Progress Indicator:** this indicator recognizes that proficiency of the English language is vital to academic success of the English learner population in the K-12 environment and beyond, and rewards students and schools for working toward proficiency of the English language.

Indicator	Measure	Description
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indiana’s Learning Evaluation Assessment Readiness Network (ILEARN) assessment for grades 3-8 • Indiana’s Alternate Measure (I AM) assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities • Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) for grade 10 (transitioning to college entrance exam with the 2023 cohort) • Adequate growth rate/growth to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level proficiency rate and participation rate in the subject areas of English/language arts and Mathematics for grades 3-8 and 10, measured annually based on the statewide annual assessment and alternate assessment • Includes growth metric for high school at grade 10 that’s calculated in the same manner as the academic progress indicator for elementary and middle schools • School-level performance measured

	standard for grade 10	against a statewide long-term goal for academic achievement
Academic Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILEARN for grades 4-8 • Adequate growth rate/growth to standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilizes student growth percentiles (SGPs) and growth targets to determine if adequate annual growth has been made (note: first two years will utilize normative growth calculation) • School-level performance measured against a statewide long-term goal for academic progress
Graduation Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate • School-level performance measured against a statewide long-term goal for graduation rate
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment • Adequate growth rate/Growth to Standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level proficiency and progress rate for the English learner student group for grades 1 through 12, measured annually based on the state assessment for English language acquisition • Utilizes student growth percentiles (SGPs) and growth targets to determine if annual growth has been made • Incorporates students who demonstrated English language proficiency • School-level performance measured against statewide-long-term goal for English language proficiency progress
School Quality or Student Success—Model Attendees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students demonstrating excellent or improved attendance rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level measure of students in kindergarten through grade 12 that meet one of two definitions of a “model attendee”—persistent attendee or improving attendee • School-level performance measured against statewide long-term goal for model attendees
School Quality or Student Success—Closing Achievement Gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILEARN assessment for grades 4-8 • Adequate growth/growth to standard for the lowest performing 25% of students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilizes student growth percentiles (SGPs) and growth targets to determine if adequate annual growth has been made (note: first two years will utilize normative growth calculation) • School-level performance for the student group is measured against a statewide long-term goal for closing achievement gaps
School Quality or Student Success—Strength of Diploma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in four-year adjusted cohort attaining certain diploma type 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-level measure of students earning a certain diploma designation • School-level performance is measured against statewide long-term goal for

		diploma strength
--	--	------------------

Academic Achievement Indicator

The academic achievement indicator is based on the same measure as the statewide long-term goal for improving academic achievement, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing statewide proficiency levels for all students and for each student group. The academic achievement indicator measures the performance of all students on the statewide annual assessment and its alternate in the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics. Performance results of individual student groups on the Academic Achievement Indicator will be calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

Elementary and middle schools, or schools with any of grades 3 through 8, and high schools, or schools with grade 10, receive a score and status for English/language arts and mathematics based on the product of the proficiency rate and the participation rate on the statewide annual assessment¹⁷. The proficiency rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with valid test results. The participation rate considers how many students participated in the statewide annual assessment in the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics, respectively. The participation rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year. Students receiving either an undetermined result or no result on the statewide annual assessment are considered as “non-participants” when calculating the participation rate. If a school satisfies the requirement to assess at least 95 percent of the students enrolled at the school during the test window, then the participation multiplier defaults to one. If a school fails to satisfy the 95 percent participation rate requirement, then the proficiency rate for the respective subject area is multiplied by the actual participation rate. The proficiency rate and participation rate for each subject area are multiplied together to yield a base subject area score. For example, a school with a math proficiency rate of 80% and a math participation rate of 98% receives a base subject area score of 80.0 points (80×1.0), whereas a school with a math proficiency rate of 80% and a math participation rate of 90% receives a base subject area score of 72.0 points ($80 \times .90$).

The school’s base subject area scores are then considered against the statewide long-term goals for academic achievement in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of the school’s achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final subject area score. The long-term goal set for the “all students” group for the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics are each translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term academic achievement goal. This goal factor is how the indicator measures the school’s achievement on the indicator in relation to the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is by the end of the 2025-2026 school year. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal and may reset the goals for the academic achievement indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.

The long-term goals for the academic achievement indicator are as follows¹⁸:

- E/La Proficiency, Grades 3-8: 74.0% (goal factor = $100/74 = 1.35$)
- Math Proficiency, Grades 3-8: 74.0% (goal factor = $100/74 = 1.35$)
- E/La Proficiency, Grade 10: 80.0% (goal factor = $100/80 = 1.25$)
- Math Proficiency, Grade 10: 67.0% (goal factor = $100/67 = 1.49$)

The academic achievement indicator for high schools, or schools with grade 10, also includes a growth

¹⁷ Beginning with the 2023 cohort, the assessment for high schools used for the Academic Achievement Indicator will be a nationally recognized college entrance exam aligned to national college-ready benchmarks. This assessment has yet to be selected.

¹⁸ Goals used for the indicator are rounded to the nearest whole number.

component. The growth component is explained in further detail under the “academic progress indicator” section below. The growth component of the academic achievement indicator for high schools will no longer be included after the 2019-2020 school year, or accountability determinations released during the fall of 2020. This change is due to the statewide transition to a college entrance exam for the high school annual assessment.

These final subject area scores are ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established is provided in section 4.D.i. below.

	E/La 3-8 Points	Math 3-8 Points	E/La 10 Points	Math 10 Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 135.00	100.00 – 135.00	100.00 – 125.00	100.00 – 149.00
Meets Expectations	64.67 – 99.99	64.53 – 99.99	74.59 – 99.99	51.70 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	33.48 – 64.66	31.46 – 64.52	43.02 – 74.58	27.15 – 51.69
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 – 33.47	0.00 – 34.15	0.00 – 43.01	0.00 – 27.14

Calculation Example, Academic Achievement:

English/Language Arts Score:

students at proficiency + # students above proficiency

students enrolled \geq 162 days with valid test results

X

x Goal Factor

students with valid test results

students enrolled \geq 162 days

Mathematics Score:

students at proficiency + # students above proficiency

students enrolled \geq 162 days with valid test results

X

x Goal Factor

students with valid test results

students enrolled \geq 162 days

E/La Growth Score, Grade 10:

students meeting/exceeding annual growth target

students enrolled \geq 162 days with SGP

x Goal Factor

Math Growth Score, Grade 10:

students meeting/exceeding annual growth target

students enrolled \geq 162 days with SGP

x Goal Factor

Academic Progress Indicator

The academic progress indicator is based on the same measures as the statewide long-term goal for improving academic progress, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing statewide proficiency levels for all students and each student group. The academic progress indicator measures the growth of all students on the mandatory statewide assessment in the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics. Growth

results of individual student groups on the academic progress indicator are calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

Elementary and middle schools, or schools with any of grades 4 through 8, receive a score and status for English/language arts and mathematics based on the school’s adequate growth rate. The adequate growth rate utilizes student growth percentiles as the basis of the growth measure. The student growth percentile metric is based on how a student performed on the current year assessment when compared with Indiana students who had similar achievement on the previous year’s assessment. Therefore, student growth is calculated for all students based on their relative position in comparison to academic peers.

Each student receives a student growth percentile ranking annually. This ranking indicates how much the student grew relative to his or her academic peers. For example, a student with a student growth percentile score of “65” grew more than 65% of his or her academic peers. That student growth percentile is then compared to a growth target that translates into the amount of growth necessary for the student to reach proficiency in four years, in alignment with the statewide long-term goal for improving academic progress. The school receives credit for each student demonstrating adequate growth by meeting or exceeding the annual growth target, or attaining proficiency. This in turn determines the school’s adequate growth rate, which translates into the base subject area score. The adequate growth rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with two consecutive valid test results.

The school’s base subject area scores are then considered against the statewide long-term goals for academic progress in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of a school’s achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final subject area score. The long-term goal set for the “all students” group for the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics are each translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term academic progress goal. This goal factor is how the indicator measures the school’s achievement on the indicator in relation to the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is achievement by the end of the 2025-2026 school year. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal, and may reset the goals for the academic progress indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.

The long-term goals for the academic progress indicator are as follows¹⁹:

- E/La Growth, Grades 4-8: 76.0% (goal factor = $100/76 = 1.32$)
- E/La Growth, Grade 10: 82.0% (goal factor = $100/86 = 1.22$)
- Math Growth, Grades 4-8: 69.0% (goal factor = $100/86 = 1.45$)
- Math Growth, Grade 10: 80.0% (goal factor = $100/80 = 1.25$)

These final subject area scores are ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established is provided in section 4.D.i. below.

	E/La 4-8 Points	Math 4-8 Points	E/La 10 Points	Math 10 Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 132.00	100.00 – 145.00	100.00 – 122.00	100.00 – 125.00
Meets Expectations	68.24 – 99.99	54.81 – 99.99	78.69 – 99.99	74.00 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	45.80 – 68.23	31.40 – 54.80	49.08 – 78.68	26.68 – 73.99
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 – 45.79	0.00 – 31.39	0.00 – 49.07	0.00 – 26.67

Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, Indiana will transition to a new statewide annual assessment. As such, the academic progress indicator will not be based on the adequate growth rate because multiple years of

¹⁹ Goals used for the indicator are rounded to the nearest whole number.

results on the new assessment will be needed in order to validly determine adequate growth targets. The academic progress indicator will be based on the rate of students demonstrating standard or high growth as it relates to that particular school year as compared to the established goal factor, or normative growth. This methodology will be utilized for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 accountability determinations. Indiana will begin to utilize the adequate growth rate methodology outlined above with the 2020-2021 accountability determinations. Because the student growth percentile looks at the relative position of a student to his or her academic peers, as long as all students take the same assessment, the student growth percentile can describe the progress of students.

Calculation Example, Academic Progress:

E/La Score:

$$\frac{\# \text{ students meeting/exceeding annual growth target} + \# \text{ students reaching proficiency}}{\# \text{ students enrolled} \geq 162 \text{ days with SGP}} \times \text{Goal Factor}$$

Math Score:

$$\frac{\# \text{ students meeting/exceeding annual growth target} + \# \text{ students reaching proficiency}}{\# \text{ students enrolled} \geq 162 \text{ days with SGP}} \times \text{Goal Factor}$$

Graduation Rate Indicator

The graduation rate indicator is based on the same measures as the statewide long-term goal for improving graduation rates and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing graduation rates for all students and each student group. The graduation rate indicator measures the performance of all students. Graduation rate results of individual student groups on the graduation rate indicator are calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

During the 2017 legislative session, the Indiana General Assembly revised the state graduation requirements to remove the passage of a graduation qualify exam in order to receive a diploma. The graduation qualifying exam was replaced by a new requirement, which is referred to as “graduation pathways”. The graduation pathways require each student to satisfy three criteria in order to receive a high school diploma:

1. High School Diploma: must meet the statutorily defined diploma credit and curricular requirements.
2. Learn & Demonstrate Employability Skills (must complete at least one of the following)
 - a. Project-based learning experience developed by the local district
 - b. Service-based learning experience developed by the local district
 - c. Work-based learning experience developed by the local district
3. Postsecondary-Ready Competencies (must complete at least one of the following)
 - a. Earn an Indiana diploma with an honors designation
 - b. Meet the college/ready benchmarks on the ACT or SAT
 - c. Earn a minimum AFQT score on the ASVAB to qualify for placement into one of the branches of the US military
 - d. Complete a state, federal or industry recognized apprenticeship
 - e. Earn a C average or higher in at least six (6) high school courses in a career sequence (career & technical education concentrator)
 - f. Earn a C average or higher in at least three (3) Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual credit, Cambridge International courses or CLEP exams
 - g. Complete a locally created pathway at the district level that is approved by the State Board of Education

The graduation pathways requirements for earning a high school diploma officially go into effect with the 2023 cohort; however, the Indiana General Assembly and State Board of Education provided that schools may award diplomas to students that meet the graduation pathways requirements in the 2018 through 2022 cohorts. Because the state graduation requirements now encompass indicators of college and career readiness, Indiana removed the college and career readiness indicator from its statewide accountability system in order to avoid duplication of metrics.

The graduation rate indicator utilizes the most recently finalized cohort, meaning the data used are a year in arrears to account for the summer graduates of a cohort. For example, accountability determinations released in the fall of 2019 utilize the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of the 2018 cohort because it is the most recently finalized cohort at the time of calculating the accountability determinations.

The school’s four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is then considered against the statewide long-term goal for graduation rate in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of the school’s achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final score. The long-term goal set for the “all students” group for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term graduation rate goal. This goal factor is how the indicator measures the school’s achievement on the indicator in relation to the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is by the 2022 cohort. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal and may reset the goals for the graduation rate indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.

The long-term goal for the graduation rate indicator is as follows²⁰:

- Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate: 94% (goal factor = $100/94 = 1.07$)

The final subject area score is ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established is provided in section 4.D.i. below.

	Grad Rate Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 107.00
Meets Expectations	91.91 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	32.55 – 91.90
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 -32.54

Calculation Example, Graduation Rate:

Graduation Rate Indicator Score:

$$\frac{\text{\# Graduates in Cohort}}{\text{\# Students in Cohort}} \times \text{Goal Factor}$$

English Language Proficiency Indicator

The English language proficiency indicator is based on the same measure as the statewide long-term goal for improving English language proficiency rates, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing language acquisition rates of English learners in the State. The English language proficiency indicator measures the performance of the English learner student group on the annual English language proficiency assessment. Indiana administers the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment to English learners in kindergarten through grade 12 as its annual English language proficiency assessment. Student growth toward and achievement of

²⁰ The goal used for the indicator is rounded to the nearest whole number.

proficiency, as measured by the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment, is the basis of the English language proficiency indicator.

Feeder, elementary, and middle schools, or schools with any of grades 1 through 8, and high schools, or schools with any of grades 9 through 12, receive a score and status for the English language proficiency indicator based on the rate of students identified as English learners that either meet or exceed annual growth targets or attain English language proficiency during the accountable year.

Indiana uses the growth-to-standard model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. Each student receives a growth target based on a student growth percentile analyses that calculates growth trajectories and projections to English language proficiency and considers the student's grade level, age and proficiency level upon initial identification as an English learner. Each year after the student's initial identification and administration of the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment, the student is expected to make adequate growth toward English language proficiency, with the ultimate goal of attaining English language proficiency within six years of initial identification. This timeline aligns with the statewide long-term goal that 70 percent of English learners meet or exceed annual growth targets by the end of the 2022-2023 school year. A student who meets or exceeds his or her annual growth target counts toward the school's English language proficiency and progress rate. Additionally, a student who attains proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment counts toward the school's proficiency and progress rate. The English learner proficiency and progress rate is calculated based on those English learner students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with valid WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment results for the prior and current school years. A student enrolled for at least 90 percent of the school year that demonstrates proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment but only has one year of assessment results may count in the school's proficiency and progress rate. A student who meets or exceeds her annual growth target and attains proficiency in the same school year only counts once toward the school's proficiency and progress rate. In Indiana, the attainment of English proficiency is defined as the point at which language proficiency no longer masks or inhibits students' demonstration of mastery of rigorous content-area standards. Currently, an English learner is considered to have demonstrated English language proficiency if the English learner achieves a level 5.0 or higher on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment.

The school's proficiency and progress rate is then considered against the statewide long-term goal for English language proficiency in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of the school's achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final score. The long-term goal set for English language proficiency is translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term goal. This goal factor is how the indicator measures the school's achievement on the indicator in relation to the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is by the end of the 2022-2023 school year. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal and may reset the goals for the English language proficiency indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.

The long-term goal for the English language proficiency indicator is as follows²¹:

- EL Proficiency and Progress: 70.0% (goal factor = $100/70 = 1.43$)

The final subject area score is ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established is provided in section 4.D.i. below.

	ELP Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 143.00
Meets Expectations	49.73 – 99.99

²¹ The goal used for the indicator is rounded to the nearest whole number.

Approaches Expectations	37.24 – 49.72
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 – 37.23

Calculation Example, English Language Proficiency Progress:

$\frac{\# \text{ ELs meeting/exceeding annual growth target} + \# \text{ ELs attaining English language proficiency}}{\text{Total \# ELs enrolled} \geq 162 \text{ days}} \times \text{Goal Factor}$
--

School Quality/Student Success Indicator: Model Attendees

The model attendee indicator measures the performance of all students. The inclusion of this indicator aligns with the Department’s strategic plan, and provides for a way to monitor the State’s performance toward achievement of the goals outlined in the strategic plan. Performance results of individual student groups on the model attendee indicator are calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

Indiana annually collects student attendance data from all public schools in the State, in compliance with data reporting guidelines. Pursuant to Indiana Code § 20-33-2-3.2, “attend” means to be physically present in school or at another location where the school’s educational program is being conducted. The model attendee indicator utilizes this definition to differentiate between whether a student counts as attending. All public schools in Indiana must also report excused and unexcused absences. For purposes of the model attendee indicator, all absences are considered the same regardless of whether the absence was excused or unexcused to control for consistency across the State.

Regular school attendance is important to the academic and social and emotional advancement of students. Poor attendance yields poor performance; precludes progress in developing grit and perseverance; and limits exposure to one’s peers.²² Research indicates a sort of “snowball effect” in the education system resulting from poor attendance, and specifically chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10 percent or more of one’s enrolled days during the school year. The chronic absentee snowball begins in kindergarten and grade 1, where research has shown that chronic absenteeism in these early grades reduces one’s chances of reading proficiency by grade 3. Specifically, a study conducted by Applied Survey Research found that only 17 percent of students who were chronically absent in kindergarten and grade 1 were reading proficiently by grade 3, versus 64 percent of students who were not chronically absent in kindergarten and grade 1.²³ Further, chronic absenteeism in kindergarten through grade 2 was identified as a strong predictor of continued chronic absenteeism in middle and high school, as well as a predictor of retention, behavior issues and low academic performance in elementary school.²⁴

As one moves higher in grade level, the snowball becomes more unmanageable. Research indicates that students with strong attendance in grade 5 are more likely to have strong attendance in middle school, whereas students with poor attendance in grade 5 are more likely to have poor attendance in middle school. A study conducted by the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research found that two-thirds of chronically absent students in grade 8 had been chronically absent one or more years since grade 5.²⁵

²² Ginsburg, A.; Jordan P.; & Chang, H. (2014). *Absences add up: How school attendance influences student success*. Retrieved from http://www.attendanceworks.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Absences-Add-Up_090114-1-1.pdf.

²³ Attendance Works. (2014). *Attendance in the early grades: Why it matters for reading*. Retrieved from <http://www.attendanceworks.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Attendance-in-the-Early-Grades.pdf>. Chen, P. & Rice, C. (2016). *Showing up matters: the state of chronic absenteeism in New Jersey: 2nd annual report*. Retrieved from https://acnj.org/downloads/2016_09_13_chronicabsenteeism_2ndannualreport.pdf.

²⁴ Chen & Rice. (2016).

²⁵ Allensworth, E.; Gwynne, J.; Moor, P.; de la Torre, M. (2014). *Looking forward to high school and college: Middle grade indicators of readiness in Chicago Public Schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago consortium on Chicago school research. Retrieved at <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Middlepercent20Gradespercent20Report.pdf>.

Further, middle school attendance has been found to be one of the strongest predictors of high school success.²⁶ By grade 6, chronic absenteeism becomes an early warning sign that a student is more likely to drop out of high school than his or her peers with good attendance;²⁷ and a student who is chronically absent in middle school has a 50 to 75 percent chance of being “off-track” in grade 9.²⁸

Indiana hopes to take a proactive approach to chronic absenteeism by incorporating it into the statewide accountability system as an indicator of school quality and student success. Feeder, elementary, and middle schools, or schools with any of grades kindergarten through grade 8, and high schools, or schools with any of grades 9 through 12, receive a score and status for the model attendee indicator based on the school’s model attendee rate. The model attendee rate is the total number of students that demonstrate either persistent attendance (attendance rate of at least 96 percent) or improving attendance (attendance rate increased by at least 3 percentage points from prior to current school year) during the accountable year. The model attendee rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year. A student who meets the definition of both a persistent attendee and an improving attendee in the same school year only counts once toward the school’s model attendee rate.

The school’s model attendee rate is then considered against the statewide long-term goal for model attendees in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of the school’s achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final score. The long-term goal set for model attendees is translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term goal. This goal factor is how the indicator measures the school’s achievement on the indicator in relation to the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is by the end of the 2025-2026 school year. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal and may reset the goal for the model attendee indicator.

This indicator alerts schools to those students who are not meeting the definition of a persistent attendee or an improving attendee, and brings attention to those students who are chronically absent or at risk of falling into the pattern of poor attendance.

The long-term goal for the addressing chronic absenteeism indicator is as follows²⁹:

- Model attendee rate, Kindergarten – Grade 12: 83.0% (goal factor = $100/83 = 1.21$)

These final subject area scores are ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established to provide for meaningful differentiation is outlined in section 4.D.i. below.

	ACA Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 121.00
Meets Expectations	83.75 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	71.00 – 83.74
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 – 70.99

In 2017-2018, the statewide model attendee rate for elementary and middle schools was 68.1 percent, and the statewide model attendee rate for high schools was 61.9 percent. These statewide rates indicate the ability to meaningfully differentiate elementary, middle and high schools on the addressing chronic absenteeism indicator. A breakdown of school performance on the addressing chronic absenteeism indicator for the 2017-



²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ Baltimore Education Research Consortium (20110. Destination graduation: sixth grade early warning indicators for Baltimore city schools their prevalence and impact. <http://baltimore-berc.org/pdfs/SixthGradeEWIFullReport.pdf>.

²⁸ Allensworth; Gwynne; Moor; de la Torre. (2014).

²⁹ The goal used for the indicator is rounded to the nearest whole number.

2018 school year indicates the following differentiation among schools in Indiana:



Calculation Example, Addressing Chronic Absenteeism:

$\frac{\# \text{ persistent attendees} + \# \text{ improving attendees}}{\# \text{ students enrolled} \geq 162 \text{ days}}$	$\times \text{ Goal Factor}$
---	------------------------------

A Note on the Climate and Culture Assessment/Survey

The long-term goal for the School Quality/Student Success Indicator for kindergarten through grade 8 is to utilize a school climate and culture assessment. Strong support from stakeholders was given to the inclusion of a school culture and climate assessment. Indiana recognizes that further work needs to be done before a climate and culture assessment may be successfully implemented in a statewide accountability system, including an audit of statewide capacity; a review of necessary resources; a study of what climate and culture

metrics are valued; and a scan of current data collections to determine where data collections may need to be expanded. Indiana will work with State, district and school leaders in education to develop the long-term culture and climate indicator during the 2017-2018 school year that allows for meaningful differentiation; is valid, reliable and comparable statewide; and is able to be disaggregated by student group. The Department intends to bring forth a proposal to the state board during the summer of 2018. This proposal will also include a timeline and roll-out plan to ensure that implementation of the indicator may be successful and contribute meaningful information to schools and the public.

School Quality/Student Success Indicator: Closing Achievement Gaps

The closing achievement gaps indicator is based on the same measures as the statewide long-term goal for improving academic progress, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing statewide proficiency levels for all students and each student group. The closing achievement gaps indicator measures the growth of the lowest performing quartile of students at each school on the mandatory statewide assessment in the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics, and weights the growth of the lowest performing quartile of students at 90% of the overall indicator score. The other 10% of the indicator score is contributed to the growth of all other students at the school. Growth results on the closing achievement gaps indicator are calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

Elementary and middle schools, or schools with any of grades 4 through 8, receive a score and status for English/language arts and mathematics based on the school’s adequate growth rate. The adequate growth rate of students performing in the lowest quartile of students at the school comprises 90% of the indicator score, and the adequate growth rate of all other students at the school comprises 10% of the indicator score. The adequate growth rate utilizes student growth percentiles as the basis of the growth measure. The student growth percentile metric is based on how a student performed on the current year assessment when compared with Indiana students who had similar achievement on the previous year’s assessment. Therefore, student growth is calculated for all students based on their relative position in comparison to academic peers.

Each student receives a student growth percentile ranking annually. This ranking indicates how much the student grew relative to his or her academic peers. For example, a student with a student growth percentile score of “65” grew more than 65% of his or her academic peers. That student growth percentile is then compared to a growth target that translates into the amount of growth necessary for the student to reach proficiency in four years, in alignment with the statewide long-term goal for improving academic progress. The school receives credit for each student demonstrating adequate growth by meeting or exceeding the annual growth target, or attaining proficiency. This in turn determines the school’s adequate growth rate, which translates into the base subject area score. The adequate growth rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with two consecutive valid test results.

The school’s base subject area scores are then considered against the statewide long-term goals for closing achievement gaps in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of a school’s achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final subject area score. The long-term goal set for the subject areas of English/language arts and mathematics are each translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term closing achievement gaps goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is achievement by the end of the 2025-2026 school year. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal, and may reset the goals for the closing achievement gaps indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.

The long-term goals for the closing achievement gaps indicator are as follows³⁰:

- E/La Closing Achievement Gaps, Grades 4-8: 66.0% (goal factor = $100/79 = 1.52$)

³⁰ The goal used for the indicator is rounded to the nearest whole number.

- Math Closing Achievement Gaps, Grades 4-8: 59.0% (goal factor = $100/79 = 1.69$)

These final subject area scores are ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established to provide for meaningful differentiation is outlined in section 4.D.i. below.

	E/La Points	Math Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 152.00	100.00 – 169.00
Meets Expectations	53.65 – 99.99	31.94 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	36.88 – 53.64	27.91 – 31.93
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.00 – 36.87	0.00 – 27.90

Calculation Example, Closing Achievement Gaps Indicator

English/Language Arts Score:

$[(\text{bottom } 25\% \text{ adequate growth} \times 90\%) + (\text{top } 75\% \text{ adequate growth} \times 10\%)] \times \text{goal factor}$

Mathematics Score:

$[(\text{bottom } 25\% \text{ adequate growth} \times 90\%) + (\text{top } 75\% \text{ adequate growth} \times 10\%)] \times \text{goal factor}$

School Quality/Student Success Indicator: Strength of Diploma

The strength of diploma indicator is based on the same measure as the statewide long-term goal for improving the rigor of diplomas earned, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing rigorous diplomas for all students and each student group. The inclusion of this indicator aligns with the Department's strategic plan, and provides for a way to monitor the State's performance toward achievement of the goals outlined in the strategic plan. The strength of diploma indicator measures the performance of all students. Results of individual student groups on the strength of diploma indicator are calculated in the same manner for all students and each student group, and reported out annually.

Pursuant to Indiana Code, a student who does not achieve a passing score on the graduation exam or does not successfully complete a postsecondary readiness competency (graduation pathway) may still satisfy graduation requirements by receiving a waiver. Students who receive a diploma due to such a waiver being granted do not count in the numerator for the strength of diploma indicator. As such, schools receive credit only for students who satisfy all graduation requirements without being granted a waiver in the strength of diploma indicator.

Indiana has one diploma with different designations attached: General designation, Core 40 designation, Academic Honors designation, and Technical Honors designation. These designations indicate the level of course and curricular rigor completed by the student. Indiana believes that the more rigorous the course and curricular requirements, the more prepared the student for postsecondary pursuits.

The strength of diploma indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort, as defined by Sec. 8101(25)(A) of the ESSA. Students receiving an Indiana diploma count as graduates for the school. The school receives credit for each graduate in the cohort earning a non-waiver diploma with a Core 40 designation, Academic Honors designation, or Technical Honors designation. The strength of diploma indicator utilizes the most recently finalized cohort, meaning the data used are a year in arrears, to account for the summer graduates of a cohort. For example, accountability determinations released in the fall of 2019 utilize the four-year adjusted cohort of the 2018 cohort because it is the most recently finalized cohort at the time of calculating the accountability determinations.

The school’s strong diploma rate is then considered against the statewide long-term goal in order to measure the percent of the long-term goal achieved by the school. The measure of a school's achievement in relation to the long-term goal determines a final score. The long-term goal for the strength of diploma indicator is translated into a goal factor by dividing 100 by the long-term goal. The timeline to meet the long-term goal is achievement by the 2022 cohort. At that time, the Department will reassess the long-term goal, and may reset the goals factors for the strength of diploma indicator to align with any changes to the long-term goal.


The long-term goal for the strength of diploma indicator is as follows³¹:

- Strength of Diploma: 93.0% (goal factor = $100/93 = 1.08$)

These final subject area scores are ultimately compared to a set of cuts to determine which of the following performance statuses the school achieved. An explanation of how the point thresholds for each category were established to provide for meaningful differentiation is outlined in section 4.D.i. below.

	Strength of Diploma Points
Exceeds Expectations	100.00 – 108.00
Meets Expectations	91.70 – 99.99
Approaches Expectations	77.94 – 91.69
Does Not Meet Expectations	0.0 – 77.93

For the 2018 cohort, the statewide strength of diploma rate was 74.0 percent. This statewide rate indicates the ability to meaningfully differentiate high schools on the strength of diploma indicator. A breakdown of school performance on the strength of diploma indicator for the 2018 cohort indicates the following differentiation among schools in Indiana:



Calculation Example, Strength of Diploma Indicator

$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{\# non-waiver students receiving Indiana Diploma with Core 40 designation or higher} \\ \text{\# students in most recently finalized four-year adjusted cohort} \end{array}}{\text{\# students in most recently finalized four-year adjusted cohort}} \times \text{Goal Factor}$
--

³¹ The goal used for the indicator is rounded to the nearest whole number.

B. Subgroups.

- i. Describe the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group, consistent with §200.16(a)(2).

Indiana's accountability system includes the following student groups when the minimum number of students required is met: All students, American Indian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, Students with Disabilities, English learners, and Economically Disadvantaged Students. Indiana does not include any additional student groups, or a combination of multiple student groups, in its accountability system.

- ii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedures for:
 - a. Former English learners consistent with §200.16(b)(1).

For accountability calculations, Indiana uniformly includes the results of English learners previously identified as Limited-English Proficient that have been re-designated as Fluent-English Proficient in the English learner student group for an additional four years after re-designation as Fluent-English Proficient.

- b. Recently arrived English learners in the State to determine if an exception is appropriate for an English learner consistent with section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and §200.16(b)(4).

Indiana uniformly applies statewide flexibility as it pertains to English learners that have recently arrived in the United States. Indiana defines a "recently arrived English learner" as an English learner enrolled in US schools for less than twelve cumulative months during the school year. Indiana uniformly applies statewide flexibility for recently arrived English learners to provide three years before fully incorporating the achievement results of recently arrived English learners in the English/language arts scores for the academic achievement indicator and the academic progress indicator. In year one, recently arrived English learners participate in the statewide annual assessment in the subject area of English/language arts, but proficiency results are excluded from accountability calculations and determinations. In year two, recently arrived English learners participate in the statewide annual assessment in the subject area of English/language arts, and only growth scores are included in accountability calculations and determinations. In year three and beyond, recently arrived English learners will participate in the statewide annual assessment in English/language arts, and achievement and growth scores are included in accountability calculations and determinations. Year one is considered the first year a recently arrived English learner is assessed on the statewide annual assessment. Year two is considered the second year a recently arrived English learner is assessed on the statewide annual assessment. Year three is considered the third year a recently arrived English learner is assessed on the statewide annual assessment.

Recently arrived English learners are included in all other subject areas and indicators, as applicable, in the same manner as all other students.

- C. Minimum Number of Students.** Describe the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with §200.17(a)(3).

Indiana's state accountability system has traditionally had multiple minimum numbers dependent upon the indicator. For example, a minimum number of 30 was established for proficiency

determinations; a minimum number of 10 was established for graduation rate determinations; and a minimum number of 40 was established for growth determinations.

As part of the consultation and coordination around the State Plan, Indiana established an accountability work group to consult regarding the alignment of Indiana's accountability system with the requirements of the ESSA. This work group included teachers, principals and other school leaders, superintendents, parents, and representatives from stakeholder interest groups and organizations. The minimum number of students for accountability determinations was a topic of discussion for this workgroup. Emerging from this discussion were two primary schools of thought: all students should be included in accountability, and no students should be masked; and a lower n-size may have too large an impact on a school's performance by skewing the perception of that performance. There was certainly some difficulty in finding a balance between promoting accountability for all students and ensuring validity and reliability of accountability determinations. Ultimately, the determination was made to establish a minimum number at 20 students in order to be included in the statewide accountability system. It was determined that a minimum number of 20 allowed for the inclusion of more students and schools in the accountability system than the minimum numbers of 30 and 40 previously used. Further, a minimum number of 20 students was viewed to have less of an impact on smaller student populations, and did not skew the percent of performance as much as a minimum number of 10 or 15. A discussion around the minimum number of students for accountability determinations was also brought forth to Indiana's State Board of Education, where they agreed with the recommendation of the work group. In response to the consultation and coordination with the work group and the State Board, Indiana will require a minimum number of 20 students for all accountability indicator determinations. For all student and student group reporting purposes, Indiana will utilize a minimum number of 20.

Describe the following information with respect to the State's selected minimum number of students:

i. How the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in §200.17(a)(1);

Multiple data sources work together to yield the overall accountability results for schools. Therefore, Indiana has ensured that quality data practices are in place that provide for valid and reliable accountability results within a given year and over time. Specifically, transparency, inclusiveness and fairness were key in establishing a minimum number of students required for accountability purposes.

Indiana's accountability work group discussed the establishment of the minimum number of students required for use in the statewide accountability system. The discussion of the work group centered on the balancing act of creating a system of inclusion while ensuring statistical confidence in the accountability system. The difficulty highlighted by the group was the tension between the desire to include all students and schools in accountability determinations and the desire to ensure that accountability measures are not unduly influenced by particular students or very small groups of students.

Accountability scores and determinations are an amalgam of measurements weighted to reflect priorities of policy makers. The accountability system is not measuring a single phenomenon but rather an aggregate of multiple scenarios that produces one simple representation of such data for public consumption. As such, accountability determinations are not a sample to demonstrate correlation or causality of a single phenomenon but rather a census of actual student and school performance. Therefore, Indiana felt that a minimum number lower than 30 was acceptable from a statistical standpoint.

The work group did express concern with establishing a minimum number that would skew perceptions as a result of being set too low. For example, two students out of ten not meeting a goal would yield a score of 80 percent, whereas two students out of twenty not meeting a goal would yield a score of 90 percent. Further, a minimum number that is too low may compromise data privacy for students. Therefore, while there was a desire to include all students and schools in accountability determinations, it was determined that caution needed to be taken when considering the impact of setting a minimum number too low that it would impact the perception of actual performance.

In response to the feedback, the Department established a minimum number of 20 students for accountability calculation purposes and reporting purposes. This practice is above the practice recommended in the National Center for Educational Statistics 2011 report.³² Setting the minimum number of students required for accountability calculations at 20 best balanced the tension between inclusion and statistical reliability.

- ii. How other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State's uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each student subgroup under §200.16(a)(2);

Indiana's accountability system does not have procedures for averaging data over multiple years. However, Indiana's accountability system does aggregate grade level data based on two grade spans: kindergarten through grade 8, and grades 9 through 12. Aggregating grade-level data provides for more schools to achieve the required minimum number of students determined necessary to be included in the accountability system.

- iii. A description of the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;

The use of a minimum of 20 students is above the practice recommended in the National Center for Educational Statistics 2011 report to protect the privacy of individual students when disaggregating data.³³

- D. **Meaningful Differentiation.** Describe the State's system for meaningfully differentiating all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

Summative ratings are based on the performance of all students. Indiana's system of meaningful differentiation includes four (4) distinct categories of performance that are assigned to each school accordingly:

- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Approaches Expectations
- Does Not Meet Expectations

³² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting*, NCES 2011-603, accessed May 2, 2017 at <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>

³³ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistical Methods for Protecting Personally Identifiable Information in Aggregate Reporting*, NCES 2011-603, accessed May 2, 2017 at <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011603.pdf>

These four categories reflect performance with respect to policy goals for the State. The Indiana Department of Education contracted with the Center for Assessment to assist in developing concise statements of the intended interpretations and implications of each performance status that align with the policy goals. The following table outlines the policy definitions that guided the establishment of summative ratings. The establishment of these performance level descriptor profiles contribute to the meaningful differentiation of schools on the overall summative ratings.

Category	Policy Definition
Exceeds Expectations	<p>Recognizes a school that exceeds expectations in that all students have attained or are on pace to meet the state’s long-term goals with few exceptions.</p> <p>All student groups meet or exceed expectations for academic achievement or academic progress. Academic growth rates for student groups demonstrate the school is aggressively closing achievement gaps (if applicable). For high schools, the long-term graduation rate goal has been met.</p> <p>Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted supports and improvement are not eligible to be classified as an “exceeds expectations” school.</p>
Meets Expectations	<p>Recognizes a school that meets expectations in that most students have attained or are on pace to meet the state’s long-term goals with few exceptions.</p> <p>All student groups meet expectations for academic achievement or academic progress. Academic growth rates for all student groups demonstrate that the school is closing achievement gaps in most areas (if applicable). For high schools, the interim progress target for graduation rate has been met.</p> <p>Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted supports and improvement are not eligible to be classified as a “meets expectations” school.</p>
Approaches Expectations	<p>Identifies a school that approaches expectations in that some students are on pace to meet the state’s long-term goals, but performance is inconsistent for individual student groups.</p> <p>Some student groups meet expectations for academic achievement or academic progress. Academic growth rates are sufficient to close achievement gaps for some student groups. No student groups are far below the standard and/or no gaps are aggressively increasing in an “approaches expectations” school. For high schools, the graduation rate is at or above 67%.</p> <p>Schools identified for targeted support and improvement are eligible to be classified as an “approaches expectations” school. Schools identified for comprehensive support are not eligible to be classified as an “approaches expectations” school.</p>

Does Not Meet Expectations	<p>Identifies a school that has not met the state’s standard for performance.</p> <p>Students are inconsistent in achieving performance standards. A “does not meet expectations” school has multiple areas that require improvement including an urgent need to address areas that are significantly below standard.</p>
----------------------------	---

Summative ratings and associated data are calculated for each school, and shared with the public in a data dashboard format on the Department’s website.

Describe:


- i. The distinct levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under §200.18(b)(3) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;

Summative ratings are based on the performance statuses of each indicator within the accountability system that is applicable and available for the school. Each indicator receives a score, which translates into one of the following performance statuses:

- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Approaches Expectations
- Does Not Meet Expectations

These four performance statuses reflect performance with respect to policy goals for the State. The Indiana Department of Education contracted with the Center for Assessment to assist in developing concise statements of the intended interpretations and implications of each performance status that align with the policy goals. The table provided in section 4.D. on “meaningful differentiation” outlines the policy definitions that guided the point thresholds for each indicator to determine each respective indicator rating.

Point score thresholds were set to reflect these policy definitions within the designations assigned for each respective indicator, and to reflect the school’s performance on the indicator in relation to the achievement of the long-term goal. The following graphic outlines the range of scores possible and how the points are divided among the four performance categories.



The following provides a more detailed description of the cuts:

- Exceeds Expectations: The point threshold for this indicator rating is 100 points. 100 points equals achievement of the long-term goal. Therefore, anything above 100 points represents achievement beyond the long-term goal.
- Meets Expectations: The point threshold for this indicator rating is the statewide average/baseline average for the indicator multiplied by the goal factor. For example, the baseline proficiency rate of the long-term goal for grade 3-8 E/La is 66.4% and the long-term goal is 83% (1.21 goal factor). Therefore, the minimum point threshold is 80.34 for this rating.
- Approaches Expectations: The point threshold for this indicator rating is the bottom 5th percentile score on the indicator in the baseline year plus two years' worth of interim progress.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: The point thresholds for this indicator rating are zero and the minimum number of points needed for the "approaches expectations" rating.

A description of how each individual indicator is calculated, and the point thresholds that determine each performance status on a respective indicator, may be found under section 4.1.A. above.

- ii. The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with §200.18(c) and (d).

The following tables outline the weights of each indicator when determining the overall summative rating for a school. If an indicator is unavailable for a school due to the school having less than 20 students available to calculate the indicator or because the school does not provide instruction to the specific grade level to which the indicator applies, then the indicator and its weight are simply removed from consideration of the overall summative rating.

Kindergarten – Grade 8 Indicator Weighting Units	
Academic Achievement: E/La	2.0
Academic Achievement: Math	2.0
Academic Progress: E/La	2.0
Academic Progress: Math	2.0
English Language Proficiency Progress	1.0
Closing Achievement Gaps: E/La	0.5
Closing Achievement Gaps: Math	0.5
Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	1.0

Grade 9 – Grade 12 Indicator Weighting Units	
Academic Achievement: E/La	2.0
Academic Achievement: Math	2.0
Academic Progress: E/La	2.0
Academic Progress: Math	2.0
Graduation Rate	4.0
English Language Proficiency Progress	1.0
Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	1.0
Strength of Diploma	1.0

The assigned weighting units were established based on the following ideals:

For kindergarten through grade 8:

- The academic progress indicator should be given the most weight in the system because progress will lead to achievement.
- The model attendee indicator and closing achievement gaps indicator should be given minimal weight in the system because of the relative newness of these indicators to statewide accountability, but the indicator weights may be reevaluated in future years.
- The English language proficiency indicator should be given “substantial weight” in compliance with the ESSA, but its weight should also consider that the majority of schools in Indiana will not have this indicator as part of their overall grade given the small English learner populations at those schools. Therefore, out of fairness, the “substantial weight” awarded should be on the lower end of the “substantial” threshold.

For Grades 9 through 12:

- The graduation rate indicator should receive the most weight since it represents the capstone of the K-12 education and incorporates demonstrations of postsecondary readiness.
- The English language proficiency indicator should be given “substantial weight” in compliance with the ESSA, but its weight should also consider that the majority of schools will not be able to have this indicator as a part of their overall grade given small English learner populations. Therefore, in order to be fair, the “substantial weight” awarded should be on the lower end of the “substantial” threshold.
- The model attendee indicator, closing achievement gaps indicator, and strength of diploma indicator should be given minimal weight in the system because of the relative newness of these indicators to statewide accountability, but the indicator weights may be reevaluated in future years.

- iii. The summative ratings, and how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under §200.18(b)(4).

Summative ratings are based on the performance statuses of each indicator within the accountability system that are applicable and available for the school. Each indicator receives a score, which translates into a performance status. To determine the summative rating, each indicator status (exceeds expectations, meets expectations, approaches expectations, does not meet expectations) translates into a numeric value. This numeric value is then multiplied by the assigned indicator weight outlined in the tables under sec. 4.1.D.ii. above. All weighted indicator scores are totaled to determine the final summative rating for a school.

A description of how each individual indicator is calculated may be found under section 4.1(A) above.

Each school will be identified as one of the following for overall performance.

- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Approaches Expectations
- Does Not Meet Expectations

For Grades 3-8:

Academic Achievement Indicator Score (E/La)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Achievement Indicator Score (Math)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Progress Indicator Score (E/La)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Progress Indicator Score (Math)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
English Language Proficiency Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Addressing Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Closing Achievement Gaps Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
=		
Overall Summative Rating		

For Grades 9-12:

Academic Achievement Indicator Score (E/La)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Achievement Indicator Score (math)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Progress Indicator Score (E/La)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Academic Progress Indicator Score (math)	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Graduation Rate Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
+		
English Language Proficiency Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Addressing Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
+		
Strength of Diploma Indicator Score	x	Assigned Weight
=		
Overall Summative Rating		

E. Participation Rate. Describe how the State is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools required under §200.15, including if the State selects another equally rigorous State-determined action than those provided under §200.15(a)(2)(i)-(iii) that will result in a similar outcome for the school in the system of annual meaningful differentiation and will improve the school's participation rate so that the school meets the applicable requirements.

The participation rate is incorporated into the statewide accountability system under the academic achievement indicator. The participation rate serves as a multiplier under the academic achievement indicator. If a school satisfies the requirement to assess at least 95 percent of the students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90% of the school year, then the multiplier defaults to one. If a school fails to satisfy the 95 percent participation requirement, then the proficiency rate for the respective subject area is multiplied by the actual participation rate. This practice lowers the overall

academic achievement indicator score within the accountability system for any school that does not assess at least 95 percent of its students.

F. Data Averaging. Describe the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data across school years and combining data across grades as defined in §200.20(a), if applicable.

Indiana’s accountability system generates scores for schools based on two distinct grade spans: kindergarten through grade 8 and grades 9 through 12. Grade levels within each span are combined in order to generate the overall scores for each indicator of the accountability system.

Only students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, are included in the academic achievement, academic progress, English language proficiency, closing achievement gaps, and model attendee indicators; long-term goal determinations; and public reporting. Only students in the four-year adjusted cohort are included in the graduation rate and strength of diploma indicators; long-term goal determinations; and public reporting.

G. Including All Public Schools in a State’s Accountability System. If the States uses a different methodology than the one described in D above, describe how the State includes all public schools in the State in its accountability system including:

- i. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a formal assessment to meet this requirement;

Schools serving kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 are referred to as “feeder schools” for accountability purposes. Feeder schools receive a score and status for the academic achievement, academic progress, English language proficiency, model attendee and closing achievement gaps indicators. The scores and statuses for the academic achievement, academic progress, and closing achievement gaps indicators are generated based on the school or schools that receive the feeder school students after the students matriculate from grade 1 or 2. If more than five schools receive students from the feeder school, then the scores and statuses for the academic achievement, academic progress, and closing achievement gaps indicators are determined based on the average scores of no more than five schools that receive the highest census of students from the feeder school. The scores and statuses for the model and the English language proficiency indicators are based on the performance of students in kindergarten through grade 2 enrolled at the feeder school during the accountable year.

Indiana also has some schools that serve grade 9 only. Schools serving grade 9 only will be considered a feeder school for a high school. The school receives a score and status for the academic achievement, English language proficiency, graduation rate, model attendee, closing achievement gaps and strength of diploma indicators. The scores and statuses for the academic achievement, graduation rate, closing achievement gaps and strength of diploma indicators are generated based on the school or schools that receive the feeder school students after the students matriculate from grade 9. If more than five schools receive students from the feeder school, then the scores and statuses for the academic achievement, graduation rate, closing achievement gaps, and strength of diploma indicators are determined based on the average scores of no more than five schools that receive the highest census of students from the feeder school. The scores and statuses for the model attendee and the English language proficiency indicators are based on the performance of students in grade 9 enrolled at the feeder school during the

accountable year. If the grade 9 feeder school does not have at least 20 students to calculate the model attendee indicator or English language proficiency indicator, then the score for these indicators will be based on an aggregate of the feeder school and the receiving school data.

- ii. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., PK-12 schools);

Indiana's accountability system calculates summative annual ratings based on two grade spans: kindergarten through grade 8 and grades 9 through 12³⁴. The accountability system acknowledges that there are schools that serve grades from both grade spans, and accommodates these variant configurations by calculating the indicator scores and overall summative ratings with an enrollment weight consideration. Each grade span receives a score accordingly, and then the score for that grade span is weighted based on the school's overall enrollment within each grade span. For example, if a school served grades 7 through 12 and 75 percent of the student population fell into the 9 through 12 grade span, then the 9 through 12 score would make up 75 percent of an indicator score and the 7 through 8 score would make up 25 percent of an indicator score. If an indicator only applies to one grade span, then the indicator score is not adjusted based on enrollment percentage. The final scores of each indicator are then weighted based on enrollment percentage to yield the overall accountability determination.

- iii. Small schools in which the total number of students that can be included on any indicator under §200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under §200.17(a)(1), consistent with a State's uniform procedures for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable;

If a school does not have the minimum number of students required to calculate a specific indicator within the accountability system, then the indicator is not included. The school receives scores and statuses for all available accountability indicators.

If no indicators may be calculated for a school due to having fewer than twenty (20) students available for any applicable indicator, then an accountability determination is based on the combination of the three (3) most recent years of student performance data for each applicable and available indicator. The score for each individual indicator is based on an average of the three (3) most recent years of student performance data. These scores contribute to the school's identification for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

- iv. Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, students enrolled in State public schools for the blind, recently arrived English learners); and

Indiana has a separate accountability system for adult high schools that predominantly serve a population that belongs to a graduation cohort that has already graduated; or are over the age of eighteen at the time the student was enrolled at the school.

The annual summative rating for an adult high school is based on a graduation rate

³⁴ See subsection on schools serving kindergarten through grade 2 to determine how schools serving these grades are considered.

indicator and a college and career readiness indicator. The graduation rate indicator is comprised of a graduation to enrollment percentage metric (number of students graduating during the school year / within-year average number of students enrolled), and the graduation rate metric used in the general statewide accountability system. The college and career readiness indicator considers the number of graduates that either earn a state-approved industry certification; earn at least 3 hours of dual credit for an approved course; receive a score of 3 or higher on an Advanced Placement exam; or earn a score of 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate exam. The college and career readiness rate is then multiplied by a goal factor that aligns with the target that at least 80 percent of its graduates to demonstrate college or career readiness.

Adult high schools that also have students enrolled in the traditional grades 9 through 12 receive a score based on all available indicators in the statewide accountability system.

Pursuant to Ind. Code § 20-18-2-15, a school is maintained by a school corporation. Ind. Code §§ 20-21-2-1 and 20-22-2-1 respectively establish the Indian School for the Blind (ISB) and School for the Deaf (ISD). Both the ISB and ISD are established by state statute as “state educational resource centers”. These educational resource centers provide residential and day school; outreach services; and consultative services to local educational agencies to assist in meeting the needs of locally enrolled students. The ISB and ISD are not maintained by a school corporation. Therefore, the ISB and ISD do not meet the definition of a school, and do not receive an annual accountability rating. The students attending the ISB or the ISD are included in the accountability roster of the school of legal settlement, or the school that sent the student to the institution, to ensure that these students are included in the accountability system.

- v. Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable.

A newly opened school receives no accountability determination for the first year of operation. Beginning with the second year of operation, the school receives accountability scores and statuses for all applicable and available indicators. If a school does not attain the minimum number of students required to calculate a specific indicator for the accountable year, then the indicator is not included. The school receives scores and statuses for all available accountability indicators.

4.2 Identification of Schools.

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.

Lowest-Performing Schools

A Title I school is identified for comprehensive support based on whether it falls within the lowest-performing 5 percent of all Title I schools for the accountable school year. Indiana annually ranks all Title I schools based on total points earned on the accountability system. Any Title I school performing in the bottom 5 percent of all Title I schools is identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Indiana annually identifies schools for comprehensive

support under this criterion in the fall.

A school identified for comprehensive support has the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year. Indiana also publishes an annual list of ‘at-risk’ schools to provide notice of the need to drive urgency for improvement. The “at-risk” schools will be those in the bottom 10 percent of all Title I schools based on total points earned on the accountability system.

Schools with Low High School Graduation Rates

High schools are identified for comprehensive support and improvement based on whether the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is 67 percent or less. Any public school that serves grade 12, has a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 67 percent or less and has not already been identified for comprehensive support due to performing in the bottom 5 percent of schools is identified for comprehensive support. Schools are identified for comprehensive support under this criterion annually in the fall. A school identified for comprehensive support has the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year. Indiana also publishes an annual list of “at-risk” schools to provide notice of the need to drive urgency for improvement. The “at-risk” schools will be those public high schools with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate at or below 70 percent.

Schools with Chronically Underperforming Student Group/s

Indiana identifies a Title I school for comprehensive support and improvement based on whether it has one or more student groups that have been identified for additional targeted support and have not met the exit criteria within the established time frame. Any Title I school that has not already been identified for comprehensive support under another criterion and has one or more chronically underperforming student groups is identified for comprehensive support under this criterion. A chronically underperforming student group is one for which a school has already been identified for additional targeted support and improvement and did not meet exit criteria within five years of the initial identification for additional targeted support and improvement. Schools were initially identified for additional targeted support with the 2018-2019 school year. Therefore, the initial year of identification for comprehensive support based on chronically underperforming student group/s will be the 2023-2024 school year. A Title I school identified for comprehensive support will have the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year.

- ii. The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the State, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).

In order to exit comprehensive support and improvement status, a school must satisfy all of the following criteria:

- If the school was identified due to its rank in the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools, the school must either be ranked at the 11th percentile or higher of Title I schools for one year or ranked at the 6th percentile or higher of Title I schools for two consecutive years. In either scenario, the school’s overall score earned must increase from the score received upon initial identification. These requirements demonstrate improved student academic achievement because they require a statistical improvement in the school’s overall numerical accountability score that can only result from increased student performance. Reaching a percentile ranking of 6 or higher among all Title I schools would mean the school no longer

met the identification criteria; and reaching a percentile ranking of 11 or higher among all Title I schools would mean the school did meet criteria to be considered “at-risk”. This indicates major improvements overall that warrant exit from comprehensive support identification. The school has four (4) years to meet this requirement before elevating to a higher intervention.

- If the school was identified for CSI due to graduation rate, the school must either improve its graduation rate to at least 80% for one school year, or beyond 70% for two consecutive years. This requirement demonstrates improved student academic achievement because it requires a statistical improvement in the school’s overall graduation rate that can only result from increased student performance. Reaching a graduation rate exceeding 70% for two consecutive years would mean the school no longer met the identification criteria for CSI, but also did not meet identification criteria to be considered “at-risk”. Further, providing for schools that increase their graduation rates to at least 80% in one school year acknowledges the exponential growth made by the school. The school has four (4) years to meet this requirement before elevating to a higher intervention.
- If the school was identified for CSI due to one or more chronically underperforming student groups, the student group must either be ranked at the 11th percentile or higher of Title I schools for one year or ranked at the 6th percentile or higher of Title I schools for two consecutive years. In either scenario, the school’s overall score earned must increase from the score received upon initial identification. These requirements demonstrate improved academic achievement because it requires statistical improvement in the student group’s overall numerical accountability score that can only result from increased student performance. Reaching a percentile ranking of 6 or higher among all Title I schools would mean the school no longer met the identification criteria; and reaching a percentile ranking of 11 or higher among all Title I schools would mean the school did meet criteria to be considered “at-risk”. This indicates major improvements overall that warrant exit from comprehensive support identification. The school has four (4) years to meet this requirement before elevating to a higher intervention.
- The school must demonstrate a strong plan for sustainability of the progress it has made. This plan must outline the school’s theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and progress monitoring plan. Further, the plan must consider any adjustments in funding, resources and other supports that may occur after exiting comprehensive support and improvement status.

While Indiana’s statewide accountability system will experience many changes from the system initially used to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement, Indiana will continue to require any school identified for comprehensive support and improvement during the 2018-2019 school year that has not meet Statewide exit criteria to continue to implement support and improvement plans unless or until the school satisfies the Statewide exit criteria.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. The State’s methodology for identifying any school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).

Indiana considers a school to have a “consistently underperforming” student group if the overall accountability score of the student group, which includes all required indicators, falls at or below the lowest performing 10 percent of the respective student group and the student group receives an overall rating of “does not meet expectations” for two consecutive years. An overall accountability score is calculated for each student group with at least 20 students

at the school.

Schools with one or more consistently underperforming student group are identified annually, beginning with the 2019-2020 school year and utilizing the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 data. Indiana's definition of "consistent underperformance" requires a school to maintain both identification criteria for two consecutive years in order to demonstrate consistency in low performance for the student group. As such, the identification timeline does not begin until two years of data are available. A school identified for targeted support has the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year.

- ii. The State's methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

Indiana will identify a school for additional targeted support and improvement based on whether it has one or more student groups with an overall accountability determination, which includes all required indicators, at or below the lowest performing 5 percent threshold used to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. Schools will be identified for additional targeted support from among schools identified for targeted support based on consistently underperforming student groups.

Indiana first identified schools for additional targeted support for the 2018-2019 school year based on the 2017-2018 data. Indiana will identify schools for additional targeted support for the 2019-2020 school year based on the 2018-2019 accountability data. Then, schools will be identified once every four (4) years, with the next identification occurring based on the 2022-2023 accountability data.

- iii. The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).

In order to exit additional targeted support and improvement status, a school must satisfy all of the following criteria:

- For two (2) consecutive years, the student group must perform better than the levels that caused the school's student group to be identified as a low-performing student group. The school's overall score for the student group must increase from the score received upon initial identification. The school has four (4) years to meet this requirement before elevating to a higher intervention.
- The school must demonstrate a strong plan for sustainability of the progress it has made. This plan must outline the school's theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and progress monitoring plan. Further, the plan must consider any adjustments in funding, resources and other supports that may occur after exiting comprehensive support and improvement status.

Any Title I school that does not meet these exit criteria within four years of identification for additional targeted support will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.

- A. **School Improvement Resources.** Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.

Title I School Improvement Grants for Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools

~~The IDOE will award planning grants to all Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools in their first year of identification. Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools will thus receive at least one year of Title I school improvement funding (1003a), allocated to ensure they and their district achieve three objectives:~~

- ~~1. Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement;~~
- ~~2. Develop a school improvement plan that is driven by the qualitative and quantitative findings from a comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement; and~~
- ~~3. Ensure the required conditions (e.g., leadership at all levels, academic strategy, student supports) are in place to enable successful implementation of the entire school improvement plan during the following school year.~~

~~To support local efforts to develop and prepare for full implementation of comprehensive school improvement plans, the IDOE will provide the following supports prior to this planning grant phase with Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts:~~

- ~~1. Develop a model comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement;~~
- ~~2. Provide a recommended protocol for planning and conducting the comprehensive needs assessment, including strategies for meaningful stakeholder engagement; and~~
- ~~3. Define an optional menu of supports for districts and schools to support their planning and/or implementation of one or more sections of this recommended protocol.~~

~~Indiana's approach to allocating school improvement resources is informed by research conducted over the past 10 years since the introduction of a more flexible school improvement grant (SIG) program under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). These school improvement resources will support transformational interventions in schools that have been identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and/or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) through a competitive grant process. In awarding applications, the IDOE will give priority to eligible LEAs that:~~

- ~~1. serve a high number, or a high percentage of, elementary schools and secondary schools implementing CSI and/or TSI plans;~~
- ~~2. demonstrate the greatest need for such funds, as determined by the State; and~~
- ~~3. demonstrate the strongest commitment to using funds under this section to establish the conditions and implement plans that include necessary operational flexibility and support to align educational opportunities to student needs.~~

~~Given the findings from the Institute of Education Sciences report, *School Improvement Grants: Implementation and Effectiveness*³⁵, particular emphasis will be given to an LEA's commitment to establishing the necessary conditions for operational flexibility. In this study, researchers found that SIG-promoted practices that most schools used fell into the more traditional~~

³⁵ <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20174013/pdf/20174013.pdf>.

comprehensive instructional reform category and the fewest fell into operational flexibility and support. There is little doubt the lack of rigorous intervention aimed at fundamentally changing the student experience in school contributed to the overall conclusions of the report: that the SIG program under ARRA had no measurable impact on student outcomes. Rather than repeating the mistakes of the past, mainly funding light-touch interventions that may be effective in most schools but have little impact on improving student outcomes in our lowest-performing schools, Indiana will focus school improvement resources for those LEAs that demonstrate the capacity and will to implement transformational practices aimed at redesigning the educational experience in the image of the 21st century student.

Under this rubric-based, competitive process, ~~districts~~LEAs will be expected to purposefully differentiate their Title I school improvement implementation grant applications on behalf of their ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support~~ CSI Schools and TSI Schools based on each school's comprehensive needs assessment, school improvement plan and conditions for success. **Successful applications will be awarded a four-year grant that includes one year for planning and three years for implementation.** As discussed in the Supporting Excellent Educators section of this plan, ~~the Office of School Improvement will collaborate with the Office of Educator Effectiveness to work closely with low performing schools and their districts to address inequities in teacher effectiveness. For example, a district could apply for a Title I School Improvement implementation grant to support teacher effectiveness initiatives, such as those that improve instructional quality and teacher leadership, on behalf of one or more of their schools that are designated as Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools.~~

The implementation grant application and its corresponding scoring rubric will be anchored in the same evidence-based framework for school improvement around which the comprehensive needs assessment and school improvement planning template are organized. Applications will only be awarded funding if the proposed evidence-based interventions meet the requirements of being in one of the top three tiers of evidence as required under ESSA. Once these Title I school improvement implementation grants are awarded, the IDOE will integrate its monitoring of these recipients into its ongoing cycle of supports for the ~~Comprehensive Improvement Support~~ CSI schools (**regardless of the school's status**) and their ~~districts~~LEAs, with an additional emphasis on periodic resource allocation review to ensure Title I school improvement funds and other resources are promoting equity and excellence for all students.

If a ~~district's~~ LEA's Title I school improvement implementation grant application ~~for a Comprehensive Improvement and Support School~~ is not approved, the IDOE will continue to provide supports to that school and its ~~district~~ LEA as outlined in the next section on supports for ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support~~ CSI Schools and their districts. ~~Furthermore, the IDOE will consider awarding a Title I school improvement planning grant for a second year to a Comprehensive Improvement and Support School that applied for, but was not initially awarded an implementation grant, based on the quality and potential of their application.~~

Multiple-School Title I School Improvement Grants

The IDOE will also create a multiple-school Title I school improvement grant specifically for ~~districts~~LEAs with four or more ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support~~ CSI and/or TSI Schools. These funds will be leveraged to help ~~districts~~LEAs design and implement sustainable, large-scale school improvement initiatives (~~e.g., Transformation Zones, Innovation Networks~~) that meet student needs and improve student outcomes in multiple ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools~~ **eligible schools**. ~~Districts~~LEAs will not be required to include each of their ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools~~ **eligible schools** in their application, but will need to ~~explain how they plan to~~

~~support these schools separately, drawing on evidence from each school's comprehensive needs assessment~~ **provide a clear and compelling rationale for how they selected the schools included in the application.** To encourage locally-driven school improvement innovations, the IDOE will otherwise limit its guidelines and guardrails for this grant to the regulations for the use of Title I, Part A funds as well as the evidentiary requirements for evidence-based interventions under ESSA.

To improve the likelihood that ~~a district's~~ **an LEA's** multiple-school strategy for school improvement will have a demonstrable, sustainable impact on student outcomes, the IDOE will adopt the same differentiated planning and implementation grant phases as outlined above for the school-specific Title I school improvement grants. Unlike the school-specific Title I school improvement planning grant, this multiple-school school improvement strategy planning grant will be awarded in a rubric-based, competitive manner. The IDOE will require ~~districts~~ **LEAs** to apply for a one-year planning grant, with three specific objectives.

1. Fully operationalize the multiple-school strategy, including but not limited to long-term goals, short-term benchmarks, and budgets that demonstrate the district's capacity to sustain the strategy long-term;
2. Meaningfully engage stakeholders in the process of developing and refining the strategy across the planning period; and
3. Ensure the necessary conditions are in place to enable successful implementation of at least the first phase of the multiple-school improvement strategy during the following school year.

~~Districts~~ **LEAs** could also petition the IDOE for the right to apply directly for a multi-year, multiple-school implementation grant by citing evidence that they have already fulfilled the requirements of the multiple-school planning grant with fidelity.

To help facilitate the development of evidence-based, multiple-school strategies for school improvement, the IDOE will provide the following forms of technical assistance prior to this planning grant phase with ~~districts~~ **LEAs** that have more than four ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support CSI and/or TSI~~ **Schools**.

1. Connect local leaders with individuals and organizations that have a demonstrated track record of success in large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives;
2. Facilitate on-site, shared learning opportunities for local leaders to see large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives in action; and
3. Provide an evidence-based framework for large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives.

If ~~districts~~ **LEAs** fulfill the three ~~mentioned~~ **objectives** for the multiple-school Title I school improvement *planning* grant during the school year for which they are awarded these funds, they then can apply for one or two years of a multiple-school Title I school improvement *implementation* grant. This rubric-based, competitive grant process will operate similarly to the single-school implementation grant application described above in terms of its use of a scoring rubric that is aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement, in this instance focused on ~~a district's~~ **an LEA's** readiness to implement a large-scale school improvement initiative. Similarly, applications will only be awarded funding if the proposed evidence-based interventions meet the requirements of being in one of the top three tiers of evidence as required under ESSA and the proposed uses of funding abide by the regulations for Title I, Part A funds.

When a multiple-school Title I school improvement implementation grant is awarded, the IDOE will integrate its monitoring of the ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support~~ **Schools** impacted by this district-driven school improvement initiative into its ongoing cycle of supports for ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support CSI and/or TSI~~ **Schools** and their districts, focused ~~in particular~~ **on the**


extent to which resources, including but not limited to Title I school improvement funds, are being leveraged to promote equity and excellence for all students.

If ~~a district's~~ **an LEA's** Title I school improvement implementation grant application for a cohort of ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools~~ **eligible schools** is not approved, the IDOE will continue to provide supports to those schools and the ~~district~~ **LEA** as outlined in the next section on supports for ~~Comprehensive Improvement and Support~~ **CSI and/or TSI** Schools and their **LEAs**. Recognizing the complexities associated with developing plans and setting the necessary conditions for large-scale, district-led school improvement strategies, the IDOE will consider awarding a Title I school improvement planning grant for a second year to ~~a district~~ **an LEA** and the multiple that applies and is approved for a multi-school grant, based on the potential of their application and their emerging capacity to fulfill its vision.

- B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions.** Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and, if applicable, the list of State-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

The IDOE's model for supporting locally-driven school improvement initiatives will be guided by the theory of action described on the next page:


Figure 1: IDOE School Improvement Theory of Action



The IDOE will use an intentionally sequenced set of expectations for Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) and differentiate its levels of support for schools and districts to fulfill these expectations in service of supporting locally-driven school improvement efforts and improving student outcomes.

Plan and Conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)³⁶

Figure 2: Elements of a Comprehensive Needs Assessment



Supports from the IDOE for All TSI and CSI Schools and their Districts

- Defined guidelines and guardrails for a Comprehensive Needs Assessment;
- Model template for and exemplars of CNAs for various school types and contexts, with an emphasis on understanding the strengths of and opportunities for growth in terms leadership at multiple levels – classroom, school and district;
- Expectations and recommended strategies for stakeholder engagement in CNAs;
- Webinars to build local capacity to effectively conduct CNAs; and
- Title I School Improvement Grants to support effective CNAs.

Expectations for TSI Schools and their Districts

- On an annual basis, plan and conduct a CNA in line with the guidelines and guardrails defined by the IDOE, focused on the needs of students in specific student groups.
- Share the findings of the CAN with the IDOE, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged.

³⁶ The components for planning and conducting a Comprehensive Needs Assessment presented below are adapted from “Using Needs Assessments for School and District Improvement, A Tactical Guide,” authored by Julie Corbett and Sam Redding and published by the Center on School Turnaround and the Council of Chief State School Officers in 2017.

Expectations for CSI Schools and their Districts

- On an annual basis, using the template developed by the IDOE, plan and conduct a CNA in line with the guidelines and guardrails; and
- Share the findings of the CAN with the IDOE, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged.


Differentiation by School Performance Trajectory

- TSI schools and their districts can request targeted on-site or virtual technical assistance from the IDOE;
- Districts with one or more schools in year one of CSI status will receive targeted virtual technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Planning Grant for year one CSI schools;
- Districts with one or more schools in year two of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the design of and planning for the CNA; and
- Districts with one or more schools in year three or greater of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the design of planning for and implementation of the CNA.

Develop, Implement and Refine a School Improvement Plan

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment will provide CSI and TSI schools, their districts and the IDOE with a strong evidence base from which to develop new and refine existing School Improvement Plans.

Figure 3: Phases of the School Improvement Planning Process



Supports from the IDOE for All TSI and CSI Schools and their Districts

- Defined guidelines and guardrails for a School Improvement Plan (SIP);
- Model template for and exemplars of SIPs for various school types and contexts, with an emphasis on strengthening leadership at multiple levels (e.g., classroom, school, district) to increase the likelihood that the implementation of the SIP will have a positive, sustainable impact on student outcomes;
- Expectations and recommended strategies for engaging stakeholders in SIPs;
- Clearinghouse of actionable research on evidence-based interventions to include in SIPs;
- Webinars to build local capacity to effectively develop and progress monitor SIPs; and
- Title I School Improvement Grants to support the implementation of SIPs.

Expectations for TSI Schools and their Districts

- On an annual basis, develop, implement and progress monitor a SIP in line with the guidelines and guardrails and using the template defined by the IDOE, focused on the needs of students in specific student groups; and
- Share the SIP with the IDOE, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged.

Expectations for CSI Schools and their Districts

- On an annual basis, use the template developed by the IDOE to develop, implement and progress monitor a SIP in line with the guidelines and guardrails; and
- Share the SIP with the IDOE, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged.

Differentiation by School Performance Trajectory

- TSI schools and their districts can request targeted on-site or virtual technical assistance from the IDOE;
- Districts with one or more schools in year one of CSI status will receive targeted virtual technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Planning Grant for year one CSI schools;
- Districts with one or more schools in year two of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the development of SIPs;
- Certain districts with one or more schools in years two and three of CSI status will receive targeted virtual and on-site technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Implementation Grant for year two and three CSI schools; and
- Districts with one or more schools in year three or greater of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the development and implementation of SIPs.

Differentiated Improvement Activities for Adult High Schools

Indiana has adult high schools that predominantly serve a population that belongs to a graduation cohort that has already graduated; or are over the age of eighteen at the time the student was enrolled at the school. Any adult high school identified for comprehensive support because of a graduation rate less than 67% is permitted to implement differentiated improvement activities that utilize evidence-based interventions.

- C. More Rigorous Interventions.** Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).

If a school does not exit Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status within four school years, Indiana has a statutorily defined set of expectations for this school and its district. Under House Enrolled Act 1638, the Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) has the authority to assign one or more interventions to persistently low-performing schools. If a school receives the lowest designation in Indiana's school accountability model, which correlates to Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status, for four consecutive years, the INSBOE holds at least one public hearing within that school's district to consider and hear testimony concerning the following options for school improvement:

- Merging the school with a nearby school that is in a higher school performance category under Indiana's school accountability model;
- Assigning a special management team to operate all or part of the school;
- Approving the school district's plan to improve the school through the creation of a transformation zone;
- Approving the school district's plan to improve the school through the creation of an innovation network school;
- The IDOE's recommendations for improving the school;
- Other options for school improvement expressed at the public hearing; and
- Closing the school.

The INSBOE has the authority to determine which intervention(s) will improve the school and require the school and its district to implement the intervention(s). The INSBOE also has the flexibility to delay any required interventions for one year if it determines that the majority of students in the school demonstrated academic improvement during the previous school year. In sum, if a school does not exit Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status within four years, the INSBOE will engage with community stakeholders to determine the most impactful and appropriate intervention(s) for that school, thus fulfilling the ESSA requirement of assigning more rigorous interventions to persistently low-performing schools.

D. Periodic Resource Review. Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).

The IDOE will periodically review resource allocation to ensure school improvement efforts in LEAs with a significant number of CSI or TSI schools are adequately leveraging resources to promote equity and excellence for all students.

For each LEA with one or more schools identified as CSI or TSI, the IDOE will review how State, federal and other resources are allocated to examine:

- Per pupil spending, disaggregated by specific federal and State funding sources;
- Access to and investment in high-quality pre-kindergarten;
- Distribution of staff, disaggregated by evaluation ratings, years of experience and certification(s); and
- Access to advanced coursework.

The IDOE is in the process of determining the frequency with which it can faithfully conduct these reviews as well as how best to integrate these reviews into other SEA-driven analyses of LEA's data to reduce the LEA burden through a streamlined approach.

Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators

Under the direction of the Chief Academic Officer, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Offices of Educator Effectiveness, Educator Licensing, and Educator Preparation strive to build teacher and leader capacity and effectiveness to promote equitable access to excellent educators and positively impact student achievement and growth by:


- Providing technical assistance and resources for implementing induction programs, evaluation and support systems, and career pathways;
- Guiding local education agencies (LEAs) in utilizing evaluation and support system data to drive professional learning and bolster recruitment and retention efforts;
- Coordinating recognition programs to honor and reward excellent educators; and
- Establishing and implementing high-quality, rigorous preparation and licensure programs.

Theory of Action

IF the IDOE collaborates with key stakeholders, including LEAs, institutions of higher education, and educator associations, to refine existing human capital management systems that leverage evaluation and support systems to recruit, prepare, develop, support, advance, reward, and retain great teachers and leaders, **THEN** increased educator capacity and effectiveness will ensure equitable access to excellent educators and lead to improved student outcomes.

Title II, Part A is a critical funding stream for realizing this theory of action. Without Title II, Part A, neither the SEA nor the state’s LEAs can fund the support structures for improving teacher and leader quality that are essential for ensuring equitable access and success for all students. Figure 1 illustrates the IDOE’s vision for utilizing Title II, Part A in conjunction with other funding streams to operationalize a systematic approach to build and maintain excellent educators at every point along the workforce continuum. Following Figure 1 is an overview of the specific activities included in each continuum category.

Figure 1: Indiana’s Roadmap for an Excellent Educator Workforce



Support Highlights

	Activity	Funding Source(s)	SEA Office(s)	Initial Implementation
Recruitment	Web-based recruitment portal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness 	SY 2017-2018
	Promotion of the profession—“recruitment and retention campaign”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness Communications Digital Media 	SY 2017-2018
Preparation	Educator preparation program partnerships—including pre-service residency opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness Educator Preparation 	SY 2018-2019
	Educator preparation program review, approval, evaluation, and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Preparation 	SY 2013-2014
Induction	Induction programming for novice teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness School Improvement 	SY 2016-2017
Evaluation	Evaluation system implementation technical assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) State funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness School Improvement 	SY 2011-2012
	Title II, Part A LEA application revision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% administration) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness Title Grants and Support 	SY 2017-2018
Advancement & Retention	Dual credit teacher credentials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) State funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Preparation 	SY 2017-2018
	Teacher leader network and summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (4% state activities) Local sponsorships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness 	SY 2017-2018
	Instructional culture survey and responsive professional development for school leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title II, Part A (3% set-aside) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Effectiveness School Improvement 	SY 2017-2018

5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement

Instructions: Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if an SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.

- A. Certification and Licensure Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders?

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the systems for certification and licensure below.

The mission of the Office of Educator Licensing (OEL) is to work with the Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) and the Indiana General Assembly (IGA) to establish, maintain, and implement high quality educator preparation and licensure programs for educators working in Indiana's PK-12 schools. To enhance the quality of learning that takes place in our schools, we must have well-qualified individuals preparing and delivering instruction for our students. The OEL accomplishes this by 1) working with Institutions of Higher Education to develop strong preparation programs that deliver Indiana's Educator Standards; and 2) implementing alternative paths to licensure that focus on expanding access to teaching to nontraditional candidates and career changers.

Indiana takes measures to ensure that educators are learner-ready at many levels. First, the Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA) were promulgated by the INSBOE effective May 2010 to guide educator preparation and licensure. The foundation of these rules are Indiana's Educator Standards for Content and Developmental Levels, which are aligned to the Indiana PK-12 Academic Content Standards and national standards, including national Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, where available, to create a dual focus on pedagogical and content area preparation and mastery. The required assessments, called the Indiana CORE tests, are linked to the REPA standards on which preparation programs are based and were developed specifically for Indiana licensure. Indiana classroom practitioners and educator preparation professionals participated in each step of this work, from developing the educator standards, to test design, to item review and selection, to recommending cut scores. Passage of CORE tests in a candidate's content area(s) and developmental level is required by Indiana statute and INSBOE rule for initial licensure. Additionally, Indiana's legislature requires instruction in reading interventions that are direct, explicit and multi-sensory as a component of preparation programs at all levels and in all content areas.

Teachers may obtain license additions solely by passing additional CORE licensure tests with the exception of Early Childhood Generalist, Elementary Generalist, Fine Arts, Communication Disorders, Exceptional Needs, English as a New Language, and High Ability. For those seven critical content areas, teachers must complete an approved preparation program in addition to passing the CORE licensure test.

Indiana ensures that educators seeking licensure for building- or district-level leadership have the necessary context for becoming instructional leaders by requiring all administrators to have at least two years of full-time classroom teaching or school counseling experience prior to administrative licensure. Classroom teachers, school counselors, and building level administrators are initially issued a two-year induction license, followed by a five-year practitioner license upon completion of a "residency" program requiring two years full-time experience and completion of either the Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program (IMAP) or a 40-hour Professional Growth Plan.

Alternative Routes

The Office of Educator Preparation encourages the development of high-quality, standards-based alternative licensure programs designed to encourage those already in the workforce to transition to the teaching field. Indiana licensure rules allow for non-higher education programs or entities to offer state-

approved transition to teaching programs in the PK-3, K-6, 5-12, or PK-12 setting. Transition to teaching type programs, including Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellowships, Teach for America (TFA) and TNTP's Indianapolis Teaching Fellows, are available in several of our programs. In 2016 and 2017, three non-higher education based (511 IAC 10.1-3-7, Sec. 7 (a)) transition to teaching licensure programs, including two charter-based, were reviewed by a new program review team and later approved by the Indiana State Board of Education, thus becoming the first of their type approved to prepare Indiana teachers. An additional transition to teaching-type program with a Montessori focus may soon be received and reviewed by the IDOE. Regardless of type, alternative programs are expected to adhere to the same program and accreditation requirements of our traditional programs and will undergo an annual State onsite visit during their first three years of operation.

Three other alternative program routes are available for those already holding a bachelor's degree or higher:

- The **advanced degree** option (IC 20-28-5-15) allows an individual to become licensed in a secondary (grades 5-12) content area if s/he has a master's degree or higher from a regionally accredited educational institution in the secondary content area. The individual must also have at least one academic year of teaching experience in the secondary or college classroom setting, as well as successfully pass the required licensure content assessments in content and pedagogy.
- The **career specialist permit** (511 IAC 16-4-7) allows an individual to be granted a permit to teach in a specific content area. Much like transition to teaching, the individual must have earned a bachelor's degree (3.0 minimum GPA) in a secondary content area and passed the appropriate content test. The individual must also have at least 6,000 hours of non-teaching experience related to the content area within the last five years. The permit is valid for two years and can be renewed. The first renewal requires completion of a pedagogy component comprised of several required pedagogical/developmental areas of focus. The individual must begin the component within the first month of teaching. An online option was recently developed by Ivy Tech – Columbus and, following IDOE review and recommendation, approved by the State Board of Education.
- The **charter school license** (IC 20-28-5-16) is an instructional license valid for teaching only in a charter school. It is issued to an applicant with a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale in the content area the person wants to teach OR if the applicant holds a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution and passes the appropriate content area exam.

B. Educator Preparation Program Strategies. Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's strategies to improve educator preparation programs consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(M) of the ESEA?

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the strategies to improve educator preparation programs below.

The Office of Educator Preparation (OEP) is responsible for ensuring Indiana Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) and Licensing Content Programs (LCPs) meet high standards of excellence and rigor that support preparation of educators who will have a positive impact on PK-12 schools. The OEP is responsible for implementing the review and recommendation process for current and new programs by reviewing and revising educator standards, monitoring annual program reporting requirements to ensure State and federal compliance, guiding EPPs and LCPs in the Council for the

Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) review process, and identifying any programs identified as “at-risk” of losing accreditation status. Through its annual EPP data matrix reporting, the office also must refer for improvement any programs not meeting minimum matrix expectations, as required in Indiana Code 20-28-3-1 and 20-28-11.5-9. Staff within the OEP will be paid through Title II, Part A state activities funds to support these program review, approval, and monitoring processes.

Preparation Program Providers

All Indiana Educator Preparation Program Providers are expected to provide high-quality, rigorous programs. Programs are expected to be innovative and designed to meet the needs of 21st century candidates. The OEP focuses not only on program quality, but candidate quality and program completer impact on PK-12 student learning. Therefore, we require all EPP providers to seek national accreditation through CAEP and national recognition status for all programs for which a national accrediting organization or “Specialized Professional Association” (SPA) is available. If no SPA is available, then the State conducts a periodic review of the program during the EPP provider’s regular accreditation cycle (usually every seven years).^{37 38}

EPP providers must model standards for beginning teachers as incorporated in the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards³⁹. These standards illustrate what teachers “across all content and grade levels should know and be able to do to be effective in today’s learning contexts.”⁴⁰

The IDOE is responsible for conducting reviews for any new EPP or program proposal, as well as monitoring future accreditation and SPA or non-SPA (State review) status. New proposals confirmed as meeting all standards are referred to the INSBOE for final approval and state-recognition. Though EPP providers must seek and attain CAEP accreditation, final state-recognition status and duration is determined by the State Board of Education.

Existing EPP providers submit an annual report to CAEP using the online “Accreditation Information System” (AIMS).⁴¹ EPP annual reports include:

- Contact information for EPP provider and programs (ensures contact information is accurate);
- Number of program completers;
- Description of any substantive changes to EPP and/or any program (if applicable);
- Display of candidate performance data;
- Candidate and program measures (assessments, data, etc.);
- Description or summary of how EPP and/or program(s) has/have addressed any areas for improvement (AFIs) and/or stipulations. AFIs are recommendations for improvement but less serious than a stipulation. Stipulations must be addressed and can adversely impact continued accreditation status; and
- Summary of progress made toward goals or target level of performance as identified during previous accreditation visit.

The IDOE reviews the above reports annually. EPP providers not yet CAEP-accredited but approved by the INSBOE follow the same report format as above with reports submitted directly to the IDOE for an annual review.

³⁷ A list of SPAs is available at <http://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/accreditation> (see “Non-SPA State Review Process”)

³⁸ A copy of the Indiana-CAEP agreement is available at <http://caepnet.org/working-together/state-partners/state-partnership-agreements>.

³⁹ 511 IAC 13-1-1

⁴⁰ http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_A_Resource_for_State_Dialogue_%28April_2011%29.html.

⁴¹ <http://caepnet.org/aims>

Both initial licensure programs (instructional areas) and advanced licensure programs (e.g., building and district administration) must adhere to CAEP Initial or CAEP Advanced Standards. Indiana Educator Standards (CORE) are aligned to State and national standards, including any available SPA standards. Educator licensure assessments (basic skills, content, and pedagogy) are developed using the same standards.

Indiana administrator preparation programs are expected to meet educator standards and address the following:⁴²

1. Human capital management;
2. Instructional leadership, including evaluating instructional staff;
3. Behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the school;
4. Culture of achievement aligned to the school's vision of success for every student;
5. Using data to attain student achievement goals;
6. Using technological tools and systems to support effective management of the organization;
7. Financial management including building-level budgeting;
8. School safety and emergency preparedness; and
9. Rights and responsibilities of students, families, and school staff.

Teacher Candidates

Teacher candidates must pass all three Indiana CORE Academic Skills Assessments (CASA) in Mathematics, Reading, and Writing before they can be admitted into an EPP. The following are State Board-approved alternatives for the Indiana CASA:

- ACT with a score of at least 24 based on Math, Reading, Grammar, and Science;
- SAT with a score of at least 1100 based on Critical Reading and Math;
- GRE with a score of at least 1100 based on Verbal and Quantitative prior to August 1, 2011;
- GRE with a score of at least 301 based on Verbal and Quantitative on or after August 1, 2011;
- Praxis I composite score of at least 527 based on Reading, Writing, and Math if taken prior to September 1, 2013; or
- Master's degree or higher from a regionally accredited institution.

Teacher candidates who complete an Indiana EPP will have been prepared according to the Indiana Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability.⁴³ Prior to license recommendation, candidates must meet all degree, testing, and student teaching/practicum requirements, as well as show evidence of successful training in CPR-Heimlich Maneuver-AED certification and child suicide prevention. Indiana is in transition from REPA to REPA 3; the last date on which an individual may complete a REPA program is August 31, 2019.⁴⁴

Data Collection and Reporting

House Enrolled Act No. 1388⁴⁵ was enacted during the 2014 session of the Indiana General Assembly. As found in IC 20-28-3-1⁴⁶ and IC 20-28-11.5-9,⁴⁷ this act requires the IDOE to collect and report information from educator preparation programs (EPPs) annually. This information must be reported using a matrix which will be posted to the IDOE website for public interpretation of program quality. Most of the data that is required to be submitted is already submitted by EPPs during their annual reporting requirements or submissions, such as Title II.

⁴² 511 IAC 13-1-1, Sec. 1, (e)

⁴³ (REPA) developmental and content standards <http://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/rep-a-educator-standards>.

⁴⁴ Both rules are available for review at <http://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/rep-a>.

⁴⁵ <http://iga.in.gov/legislative/2014/bills/house/1388/>

⁴⁶ <http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2014/ic/titles/020/articles/028/chapters/003/>

⁴⁷ <http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2014/ic/titles/020/articles/028/chapters/11.5/>

In addition to standard and benchmark performance, a matrix will be included on the IDOE website and will be based on data collected for teachers receiving their teaching license within the previous three (3) years. Data reported for the website include the following:

- The “attrition, retention, and completion rates of teacher candidates for the previous three (3) calendar years;”⁴⁸
- Average scaled or standard scores of program completers in basic skills, content, and pedagogical testing;
- Average number of times program completers took the basic skills, content, and pedagogy tests before passing;
- Percentage passing the basic skills, content, and pedagogy tests on the first attempt;
- Admission practices of each program as they compare to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) minimum admission standards;
- Principal survey results of the quality of their teachers completing an Indiana program within previous two (2) years;
- Teacher feedback from results for those receiving initial license within the previous three (3) years; and
- Staff performance evaluation results reported in the aggregate.

To ensure consistent and reliable reporting, the IDOE must establish “standards for the continuous improvement of program processes and the performance of individuals who complete teacher preparation programs.”⁴⁹ The standards “must include benchmarks for performance, including test score data for each teacher preparation entity on content area licensure tests and test score data for each teacher preparation entity on pedagogy licensure tests.”⁵⁰ Since the new CAEP standards will be required for either CAEP or state accreditation, we have proposed their inclusion as the basis for the IDOE-established standards and benchmarks.

As of June 2015, the IDOE, in conjunction with State Board of Education staff, the Independent Colleges of Indiana, the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Commission for Higher Education, created a draft matrix and standards/benchmarks. The drafts were presented to the State Board during its March 12, 2015 meeting for discussion. The IDOE also provided a link for public comment to a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, principals and superintendents. At its May 7, 2015 meeting, the State Board of Education approved the IDOE request to begin the rulemaking process, as required in IC 20-28-3-1.

Beginning July 1, 2017, and by July 1 each year thereafter, programs not meeting the minimum ratings will be referred to the Commission for Higher Education (State and proprietary postsecondary programs) and the Independent Colleges of Indiana (nonprofit programs) for an improvement plan with performance goals and timeline by which the goals must be met.

- C. Educator Growth and Development Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's systems of professional growth and improvement for educators that addresses: 1) induction; 2) development, consistent with the definition of professional development in section 8002(42) of the ESEA; 3) compensation; and 4) advancement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders. This may also include how the SEA will work with LEAs in the State to develop or implement systems of professional growth and improvement, consistent with section 2102(b)(2)(B) of the ESEA; or State or local educator

⁴⁸ IC 20-28-3-1

⁴⁹ *ibid*

⁵⁰ *ibid*

evaluation and support systems consistent with section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) of the ESEA?

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the educator growth and development systems below.

Evaluation & Support Systems

In 2011, the Indiana General Assembly (IGA) mandated the implementation of annual staff performance evaluations for all certificated employees, including teachers, principals, and superintendents in LEAs across the state beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. Required by Indiana Code (IC) 20-28-11.5, performance evaluation systems must be implemented to provide all educators continuous feedback to increase effectiveness and ultimately improve student achievement. Specifically, state statutory and regulatory requirements include:

- Annual evaluation for all certificated employees resulting in the designation of certificated employees in one of the following categories which correspond with a numeric rating: Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Improvement Necessary (2), or Ineffective (1);
- Objective measures of student achievement and growth;
- Rigorous measures of effectiveness;
- Annual designation of each certificated employee in four rating categories;
- Explanation of the evaluator's recommendation for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected; and
- A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of "effective" or "highly effective."

Also required by State statute, aggregate school- and LEA-level educator evaluation data are posted annually.⁵¹

The IDOE has collected and publicly reported for four consecutive years statewide evaluation data for all certificated employees in LEAs with up-to-date staff performance evaluation systems per collective bargaining agreements.

Implementation Support

Indiana is primed to move beyond the culture of compliance. Existing State statutory and regulatory requirements demand evaluation and support systems. However, these systems are only impactful when the data are leveraged to inform human capital management systems. The IDOE will shift the culture from meeting minimum standards to measuring and supporting fidelity of implementation and utilizing collected data to drive professional development and instruction to improve student outcomes.

Declines in student achievement and growth in Indiana's highest-need LEAs, especially for students from low-income families, highlight the need for supportive educator evaluation systems that provide actionable feedback to teachers, creating professional learning communities where teachers share goals and responsibility for student outcomes, and forge a system where teachers have opportunity for ongoing professional development that can enhance instructional quality.⁵² The IDOE will leverage Title II, Part A state activities funds to improve LEAs' implementation of existing evaluation and support systems to ensure a fair, consistent process and the individualization of professional development. Annual reviews of LEAs' evaluation plans consistently reveal areas of noncompliance as well as areas for improvement, including: the use of multiple measures of student achievement and growth that reflect both State- and classroom-level assessment results; continuous training for evaluators based on areas of need determined by a calibration process; and an explicit process for

⁵¹ <http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations>

⁵² Hallinger, P., Heck, R.H., Murphy, J., "Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence," *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, no. 26 (2014): 5-28, [Web](#).

utilizing educator evaluation data to drive professional development. Through targeted technical assistance, the Offices of School Improvement and Educator Effectiveness will each move beyond reviews for superficial compliance to responding to such reviews with support for LEAs in their development and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation and support system.

Professional Development Alignment

Educator evaluations must serve to support professional growth. The goal of implementing comprehensive educator evaluation systems is to provide professional learning to impact student achievement and growth rather than solely holding educators accountable. Specifically, ongoing, job-embedded, and differentiated professional development to improve teachers' and leaders' knowledge and practice is critical for improving student outcomes as well as incentivizing educator retention. If teachers are not provided high-quality professional learning opportunities that respond to their identified areas of need, it is unlikely that student performance will improve.

To support LEAs with creating such alignment, the IDOE revised its LEA Title II, Part A application to include questions related to the use of educator evaluation data to drive professional development paid through these funds. Through the updated application, LEAs must now provide an evidence-based rationale for the design of their professional development systems and quantifiable program evaluation metrics to determine the systems' effectiveness. Moreover, the Offices of Title Grants and Support and Educator Effectiveness will collaborate to develop technical assistance and activity-focused spending guidance to support LEAs in aligning and layering funding streams to ensure that the proposed professional development adequately responds to the comprehensive needs assessment and educator evaluation data. These supports will be made available to LEAs through regular training and on-site monitoring.

5.2 Support for Educators.

***Instructions:** Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, provide a description with the necessary information.*

- A. Resources to Support State-level Strategies.** Describe how the SEA will use Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies designed to:
- i. Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;
 - ii. Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;
 - iii. Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and
 - iv. Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the educator equity provisions in 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c).

The IDOE will use Title II, Part A funds to support LEAs in refining their human capital management systems to increase coherence and implementation fidelity. To facilitate this work, Indiana participates in the Talent for Turnaround Leadership Academy (T4TLA) – a collaborative endeavor of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and the Center on School Turnaround to support states and their LEAs in linking equitable access and school improvement efforts. These content centers are partnering with regional comprehensive centers to provide technical assistance for participating state education agencies (SEAs) and LEAs developing and implementing approaches to recruiting and retaining excellent educators. Specifically, the IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness receives support from the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center to partner with one LEA to interpret talent management data, identify key challenges, and build upon the following state-level strategies proposed in Indiana's Equity Plan. Ultimately, the intent is to extrapolate the processes and products

developed through the T4TLA work with the single LEA to serve multiple LEAs—particularly those with educator equity gaps—across Indiana. The following are the specific state-level strategies the IDOE will employ with the support of Title II, Part A funds.

Recruitment

The IDOE will bolster the talent pipeline through targeted, strategic recruitment efforts that leverage all pathways into the profession.

LEA Tools

In service of increasing access to teacher candidates, the IDOE will use Title II, Part A state activities funds to provide all LEAs a web-based recruitment platform with application, outreach, and data collection and tracking functions. LEAs will have the ability to sort and filter based on certification, geography preference, years of experience, prior work experience, and degree; based on searches, LEA users can send individual emails to candidates that meet given criteria. This service will also include training for LEAs on a variety of recruitment topics, such as the use of social media to increase exposure and candidate flow. Furthermore, teacher candidates will be able to develop a professional profile, view and filter active job postings, and apply for multiple positions through the single sign-on platform. The Office of Educator Effectiveness will utilize the reports provided by the vendor for this platform, as well as feedback from participating candidates and employers, to develop specific resources and training for LEAs related to best practices for recruitment and hiring, including timelines and processes.

In conjunction with providing such a platform, the IDOE will convene a task force of rural LEA superintendents (and other school and district leaders) to facilitate the development of recruitment strategies that address challenges specific to their geographic and economic contexts. The task force will identify recommendations and best practices for attracting high quality teacher candidates to these areas. A focused review of quarterly and annual usage reports compiled through the web-based recruitment platform will be conducted to measure changes in the number of rural LEA applicants.

Promoting the Profession

In accordance with its commitment to attract talented teachers and keep them in the profession, the IDOE will use State funds to implement and sustain a “Recruitment and Retention Campaign” focused on reframing the public narrative concerning the quality of the teaching experience in Indiana. Resources will be equally distributed toward retaining current teachers and attracting new teachers to the workforce. Current teachers’ personal success stories from the classroom will be solicited, vetted, celebrated, and shared through digital and social media. In addition, the Campaign will target prospective teachers (from high school students to career transfers) by developing interest in the teaching profession and sharing information about various licensure pathways. Non-materialistic incentives will be highlighted, including but not limited to the rigor and reward of teaching, public service, social action, and professional advancement opportunities.

SEAs across the country are beginning to implement similar campaigns. For instance, the Oklahoma legislature enacted Senate Bill No. 15 in May 2017, which established the Oklahoma Teacher Recruitment Revolving Fund. The funds will be used cooperatively by the SEA and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to promote the teaching profession, including supporting successful programs, creating new promotional materials, and partnering with businesses and other organizations. Likewise, in 2016 North Dakota established the North Dakota Recruitment and Retention Task Force, which has explored various strategies for promoting the teaching profession. The Task Force implemented a newspaper marketing campaign and explored a larger digital marketing campaign, but decided against the digital approach given the cost.

More specifically, the Office of Educator Effectiveness staff conducts ongoing conversations with both Washington and Texas state departments of education. In the spring of 2016, Washington State passed Senate Bill No. 6455, which allocated funding for a statewide teacher recruitment campaign. The campaign has developed key messages for target audiences and largely is focused on out-of-state recruiting. Similarly, in 2017, the Texas Commissioner of Education announced the official launch of #IAmTXEd, a social media campaign that solicits, vets, and highlights stories of exceptional educators across the state.

A cross-functional team of IDOE staff will coordinate our state-wide promotional campaign with support from institutions of higher education and various education associations (e.g., Indiana School Public Relations Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, and the Indiana State Teachers Association). The team will gauge the impact of the Campaign by tracking prospective and current teacher survey responses, preparation program enrollment, and current teacher retention rates.

High School Coursework

Through its Office of PK-16 Academics, the IDOE supports multiple avenues for LEAs to build a pipeline of educators in their local communities. These pathways and courses are available for students to pursue interests in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and other specialized areas in the field of education.⁵³ Students in these pathways begin post-secondary study with a strong foundation in education and potential to receive college credit in their major.

Preparation

Staff within the Office of Educator Preparation will be paid through Title II, Part A state activities funds to support the development and implementation of the partnerships described below.

Induction

Targeted, ongoing efforts to support novice teachers are critical for increasing effectiveness, promoting longer-term retention, and most importantly, improving student achievement. The New Teacher Center recommends a systematic approach⁵⁴ to induction that incorporates an inclusive program design to address the multiple components essential for success. These components include:

- Capable instructional mentors;
- Effective principals;
- Multiple support structures for beginning teachers;
- Strong program leaders; and
- Program evaluation.

In consultation with key stakeholders, the IDOE has begun establishing a comprehensive induction program framework that builds upon the New Teacher Center's framework to support novice teacher effectiveness and nurture the reflective practitioner. The Offices of Educator Effectiveness and School Improvement are collaborating with an LEA to build out the framework and supporting tools and resources which will be made available via the IDOE's website, virtual presentations, and multiple communications channels. Prioritization and tiers of support for implementation will be based on high-need schools' demonstration of educator experience gaps.

⁵³ <http://www.doe.in.gov/cte/cluster-education-and-training>

⁵⁴ "The big picture: Comprehensive systems of teacher induction," *The New Teacher Center*, 2016, [Web](#).

Mentoring

Strategic mentor recruitment, selection, and assignment are critical for ensuring strong relationships with novice teachers—the foundation for improving instructional practice. To assist the IDOE with providing such support with induction program development, the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders has worked with the Office of Educator Effectiveness to develop a 12-hour, multi-session professional learning module (PLM) that facilitates LEAs’ cultivation of capable instructional mentors. The PLM includes information regarding selection criteria and processes as well as standards for goal setting and evaluation. The IDOE will also provide examples of timelines and processes for activities included in the turnkey model; for example, to develop ongoing mentor training and a mentor community of practice, LEAs can follow the suggested steps:

- Assign leadership to drive development and implementation of training, communities of practice, and evaluation;
- Develop mentor training scope and sequence for initial and ongoing training;
- Determine meeting times and dates for communities of practice;
- Create coaching and evaluation timeline;
- Engage mentors in refining selection criteria, roles, and responsibilities; and
- Facilitate mentor networking and professional learning.

Collaboration

Novice teachers also need specialized support beyond the instructional modeling and coaching provided by a mentor. The IDOE will assist LEAs with the development of communities of practice for beginning teachers facilitated by mentors and guided by professional teaching standards, State Academic Standards, and locally-identified instructional priorities.

Advancement & Retention

Dual Credit Credentials

Earning dual credits (high school credit that also counts for college credit) can help prepare students for postsecondary success and job placement. Additional preparation and academic qualifications for educators who are teaching courses eligible for dual credit is required by the postsecondary institutions offering those credits. The IDOE will use Title II, Part A state activities funds to partner with an institution of higher education to increase the number of educators qualified to teach dual credit courses. Funding will specifically support these educators in attaining 18 credit hours in master’s level courses in the applicable subject area(s).

Teacher Leadership

Clearly defining teacher leader roles and responsibilities that are aligned with locally-identified priorities is critical for contributing to and advancing school and district-level goals.⁵⁵ Furthermore, given that high-performing employee attrition is more likely if there is a lack of advancement opportunities,⁵⁶ LEAs should incorporate such leadership opportunities not only to reward and develop excellent educators, but also to retain them.

The IDOE will use Title II, Part A state activities funds to provide support for LEAs to adjust staffing structures to integrate career pathways and leadership development opportunities to advance and retain excellent educators. By re-envisioning such pathways for promotion, teacher leaders will have the opportunity to advance in ways beyond leaving the classroom for administrative positions.

The IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness staff contributed to the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance’s development of “Strategies and

⁵⁵ “Leading from the front of the classroom: A roadmap for teacher leadership that works,” *The Aspen Institute*, 2014, [Web](#).

⁵⁶ Doyle, D, “Leadership and lattices: New pathways across the teaching profession,” *Center on Great Teachers and Leaders*, 2015, [Web](#).

Resources for Supporting Teacher Leadership”—a compilation of tools designed to help teachers and school leaders create and support leadership roles. The IDOE will promote LEAs’ use of the tools to:

- Help teachers understand the key competencies, skills, and traits needed to serve in a leadership capacity; and
- Help leaders ensure that the district and school have structures, processes, and mindsets in place to implement a teacher leadership initiative.

Additionally, as a supporting organization of the U.S. Department of Education’s Teach to Lead initiative, the IDOE will leverage the Teach to Lead brand to host a Teach to Lead-like event, also known as a *Powered by Teach to Lead* summit. The mission of Teach to Lead is to expand opportunities for teacher leadership by providing resources, facilitating stakeholder consultation, and encouraging professional collaboration to develop and amplify the work of teacher leaders. In support of this mission, the Office of Educator Effectiveness will host its inaugural *Powered by Teach to Lead* summit for competitively-selected teams of teacher leaders to:

- Share ideas and best practices and learn from examples of existing teacher leadership efforts;
- Identify common challenges and create concrete, actionable teacher leadership plans to address them locally; and
- Network and build relationships with other educators and leaders in their region.

This summit will be modeled off of other states that have taken this approach to cultivate teacher leadership, including New York, New Mexico, Louisiana and Wisconsin. Summit planning will be led by a steering committee, which will include Milken Educators, Teachers of the Year, National Board Certified Teachers, educators recommended for the IDOE Talent Pool, and representatives from the Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, and Indiana State Teachers Association. The committee will develop an action plan that includes project goals, specific roles and duties for each member, and a communications strategy for engaging potential sponsors and advertising the event to potential participants. IDOE leadership will work with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center and Center on Great Teachers and Leaders to support the work of the committee.

School Leadership

The IDOE will reserve an additional 3 percent of Title II, Part A LEA subgrants to support principals and other school leaders (including teacher leaders) in refining instructional leadership skills, thereby promoting both teacher and student achievement and growth.

In collaboration with key stakeholders, such as the Indiana Association of School Principals, the IDOE will facilitate state-wide implementation of instructional culture audits and school leaders' development of action plans to utilize audit results to improve culture, provide targeted professional development, and identify leadership priorities.

Ensuring school leaders are able to establish a rigorous, shared vision of effective instruction using their LEAs' teacher evaluation rubric will also increase evaluators' capacity to accurately rate teachers. By participating in multiple calibration exercises and using tools to ensure inter-rater reliability within their school teams throughout the year, school leaders will build their own capacity to evaluate teachers fairly, efficiently, and most importantly, accurately. The IDOE will provide annual and ongoing training for evaluators in the areas of stakeholder engagement, observation and feedback cycles, and continuous improvement.

The IDOE will also release a request for proposal to select a training provider for teacher and school leaders on the development of professional learning approaches that are proven effective for changing adult practices in accordance with the following evidence-based criteria:⁵⁷

1. A focus on higher order, subject matter content and pedagogy of how students learn the content;
2. Involving teachers in inquiry-oriented learning approaches;
3. Grouping teachers from the same grade or subject for collaborative learning;
4. Aligning activities with other professional development and school curricula; and
5. Collecting data on at least one measure of each program objective.

B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs. Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students, consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(J) of the ESEA.

High Ability Students

The Office of PK-16 Academics staffs a specialist dedicated to providing technical assistance for LEAs' development and implementation of high ability programs. Supports for LEAs include: no-cost access to, and professional development for, curricular units of study created specifically for high ability students; facilitation of program coordinator meetings; and data compilation to target identification and servicing needs.

Students with Disabilities

Indiana Resource Network

The Indiana Resource Network (IRN) is made possible by the IDOE's Office of Special Education. It is comprised of centers that provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the state to improve teaching and learning.

Indiana Center on Teacher Quality

In partnership with schools, families, agencies and communities, the Indiana Center on Teacher Quality (ICTQ) seeks to improve educational outcomes for students by ensuring their access to a pre-K through 12 continuum of instruction from high quality teachers. ICTQ intends to 1) increase the number of high quality teachers serving students with disabilities by providing job-embedded professional development at the State, regional and district levels; 2) increase the number of students

⁵⁷ "What the Research Says About Class Size Reduction, Professional Development, and Recruitment, Induction, and Retention of Highly Qualified Teachers: A Compendium of the Evidence on Title II, Part A, Program-Funded Strategies," *Northwest Comprehensive Center*, 2014, Web.

with disabilities who have access to a high quality teacher by improving recruitment, support and retention of all teachers who teach students with disabilities across the LRE continuum (general education and special education); and 3) improve school transitions and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities through partnerships and collaborations among schools, community agencies, higher education and families in a PK-12 system of support by aligning the policies and practices of key educational stakeholders across the lifespan serving individuals with disabilities.

Indiana IEP Resource Center

The Indiana IEP Resource Center aims to increase Indiana educators' knowledge and skills that will (a) support the use of Indiana IEP to develop legally compliant IEPs that follow Article 7 requirements, (b) provide technical assistance and professional development for Indiana educators and staff who are involved in the development of high quality IEPs; and (c) support Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the development and use of procedures to ensure compliance and the fidelity of implementation of IEP goals and services that will result in high quality instruction and programming evident by data review and progress monitoring.

Project SUCCESS

Project SUCCESS supports teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities. This includes providing critical background information and access to instructional and resource materials developed by NCSC. Project SUCCESS provides monthly professional development sessions to participating teams and on-site technical assistance as needed.

Pass Project: Promoting Achievement for Students with Sensory Loss

The Pass Project provides professional development opportunities for educators that will improve instructional quality, promote academic achievement and foster successful post-secondary transition outcomes for students with sensory loss.

Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center

The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center creates and enhances professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity to improve school and post-school outcomes. The center's work focuses on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and family involvement.

English Learners and Migrant Students

WIDA Professional Development Series

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education partners with the WIDA consortium to provide annual, targeted professional development to improve the capacity of teachers, principals, and other school leaders. The trainings are chosen with input from the field to address areas of need, including leadership, assessment, data, collaboration, and instruction.

English Learner Leadership Group

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education convenes quarterly meetings and professional development with the English learner directors and related staff across Indiana representing LEAs with a wide range of English learner and immigrant populations. This group works closely with statewide associations, such as the Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL), to provide support to the field regarding evidence-based best practices, leadership development, effective implementation of EL services, and meaningful communication with parents and communities.

Request for IDOE Technical Assistance and Professional Development

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education offers recurring technical assistance and professional development opportunities to LEAs on an as-needed or requested basis. The technical assistance provides effective implementation of State and federal grants for English learners and application of laws and regulations pertaining to English learners. LEA grants must include an emphasis on professional development. The requested onsite or virtual professional development addresses individual LEA or regional needs for English learners or immigrant students, such as leadership, assessment, data, collaboration, and instruction.

Migrant Education

Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Training

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education directly and through external partners, provides training to recruiters to accurately identify and provide initial services to address the needs of eligible migratory children.

Program Evaluation

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education conducts an evaluation of the Migrant Regional Center regular school year (RSY) and summer school year (SSY) programs to identify areas of strength and need in the provision of instructional, support, and referral services.

Migrant Regional Center Director Meetings and Professional Development

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education convenes quarterly meetings and professional development with the migrant regional directors and related staff. This group works closely with other organizations that serve migrant workers, such as Teaching and Mentoring Communities (TMC) that serves preschool migratory children or Proteus, Inc. that serves adult migrant workers. These meetings provide support to the field regarding evidence-based best practices, leadership development, and effective implementation of migrant services, and meaningful communication with parents and communities.

Request for IDOE Technical Assistance and Professional Development

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education offers regularly recurring technical assistance and professional development opportunities to migrant regional centers on an as-needed or requested basis. The technical assistance provides effective implementation of federal grants and application of laws and regulations pertaining to migratory children. Local operating agency grants must include an emphasis on professional development. The requested onsite or virtual professional development addresses individual LEA or regional needs for migratory children, such as leadership, assessment, data, collaboration, and instruction. This includes specific needs related to out of school youth (OSY) and preschool migratory children.

5.3 Educator Equity.

- A. Definitions.** Provide the SEA's different definitions, using distinct criteria, for the following key terms:

Key Term	Statewide Definition (or Statewide Guidelines)
Ineffective teacher*	<i>An ineffective teacher</i> receives a summative effectiveness rating of “Ineffective” as determined through the local

	performance evaluation system that meets the requirements established by Indiana Code 20-28-11.5 An <i>ineffective teacher</i> consistently fails to meet expectations as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The ineffective teacher's students, in aggregate, have generally achieved unacceptable levels of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the IDOE.
Out-of-field teacher*+	An <i>out-of-field teacher</i> does not meet all applicable Indiana teacher certification requirements for a standard certificate (i.e., has a regular/standard certificate / license / endorsement issued by Indiana) in the subject area and grade level in which they are teaching. A teacher with an emergency or temporary credential is not considered to meet these requirements and would be considered an "out-of-field" teacher.
Inexperienced teacher*+	An <i>inexperienced teacher</i> is in the first or second year of teaching. The number of years of teaching experience includes the current year but does not include any student teaching or other similar preparation experiences. An inexperienced teacher is reported as having zero or one year of experience.
Low-income student	A low-income student is eligible for the federal free- and reduced-price lunch programs, as was defined per the IDOE's approved equity plan, Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators in Indiana.
Minority student	A minority student, used interchangeably with "student of color," identifies as American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or two or more races.

*Definitions of these terms must provide useful information about educator equity.

+Definitions of these terms must be consistent with the definitions that a State uses under 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

Other Key Terms (<i>optional</i>)	Statewide Definition
Excellent Educator	An <i>excellent educator</i> receives a summative effectiveness rating of "Highly Effective" or "Effective" as determined through the local performance evaluation system that meets the requirements established by Indiana Code 20-28-11.5.
Highly-effective teacher	A <i>highly effective</i> teacher consistently exceeds expectations and demonstrated excellence, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The highly effective teacher's students, in aggregate, generally exceeded expectations for academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the IDOE.
Effective teacher	An <i>effective</i> teacher consistently meets expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The effective teacher's students, in aggregate, have generally achieved an acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the IDOE.

- B. Rates and Differences in Rates.** In Appendix G, calculate and provide the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A using the definitions provided in section 5.3.A. The SEA must calculate the statewide rates using student-level data.

	<i>Ineffective teacher rate</i>	<i>Disproportionality</i>
Low-income students	0.37%	3.7
Non-low-income students	0.10%	
Minority students	0.85%	8.5
Non-minority students	0.10%	
	<i>Out-of-field teacher rate</i>	<i>Disproportionality</i>
Low-income students	2.48%	1.15
Non-low-income students	2.15%	
Minority students	2.84%	1.15
Non-minority students	2.46%	
	<i>Inexperienced teacher rate</i>	<i>Disproportionality</i>
Low-income students	12.35%	1.54
Non-low-income students	8.02%	
Minority students	13.77%	1.63
Non-minority students	8.47%	
	<i>Excellent educator rate</i>	<i>Disproportionality</i>
Low-income students	90.26%	.97
Non-low-income students	93.28%	
Minority students	86.88%	.94
Non-minority students	92.91%	

- C. Public Reporting.** Provide the Web address or URL of, or a direct link to, where the SEA will publish and annually update, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(4):
- The rates and differences in rates calculated in 5.3.B;
 - The percentage of teachers categorized in each LEA at each effectiveness level established as part of the definition of “ineffective teacher,” consistent with applicable State privacy policies;
 - The percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37; and
 - The percentage of teachers categorized as inexperienced teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

The IDOE will annually monitor the progress of strategy implementation in terms of reducing equity gaps through data analysis and stakeholder surveys. The IDOE will display the annual report of this progress on the Educator Equity webpage. Announcements regarding these data and reports will be posted via the Superintendent’s weekly message sent to a listserv of all superintendents and principals across Indiana. Such announcements will also be posted on the IDOE Learning Connection communities’ website.

- D. Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the likely causes (e.g., teacher shortages, working conditions, school leadership, compensation, or other causes), which may vary across districts or schools, of the most significant statewide differences in rates in 5.3.B. The description must include whether those differences in


rates reflect gaps between districts, within districts, and within schools.

Stakeholders discussed a wide range of possible root causes for the lower retention rates of Effective and Highly Effective teachers in high poverty and minority schools. An initial list of root causes included: lack of teacher mentoring and support; nonexistent or nonresponsive professional development; inadequate educator preparation; compensation; limited recruitment efforts; negative school climate or environment; increased accountability; lack of quality or consistency of leadership; and negative public and political perceptions. Upon review of these many possible root causes, stakeholders grouped and narrowed the ideas, referring back to the disparities in teacher retention.

Educator Effectiveness ratings data and the Excellent Educator retention data drove the root cause analysis and strategy development. In consideration of the greater needs of students in high poverty and minority schools, stakeholders determined that Highly Effective and Effective teachers were more likely to leave their schools as a result of deficiencies in professional development (including mentorship and support), working conditions, and a negative public and political perception. The resulting strategies and progress monitoring plans were based on these three identified root causes.

Strategies were then categorized by responsibility and implementation timeline; each strategy includes an indication of SEA, LEA, or “other” responsibility for development and implementation as well as a goal, annual target, and evaluation and progress monitoring methods. The 90-day, one year, two year, and three year timelines were determined based in part upon the availability of additional educator effectiveness data.

- E. Identification of Strategies.** If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, provide the SEA’s strategies, including timelines and Federal or non-Federal funding sources, that are:
- Designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences identified in 5.3.D and
 - Prioritized to address the most significant differences in the rates provided in 5.3.B, including by prioritizing strategies to support any schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 that are contributing to those differences in rates.



<i>Root Cause</i>	<i>Strategy</i>
Limited recruitment efforts	Bolster the talent pipeline through targeted, strategic recruitment efforts that leverage all pathways into the profession
Negative public and political perception	
Inadequate educator preparation	Foster mutually beneficial partnerships among PK-12 LEAs and institutions of higher education, promoting ongoing collaboration to develop high quality teacher candidates
Lack of teacher mentoring and support	Establish a comprehensive induction program framework based on a set of common expectations to support novice teacher effectiveness and nurture the reflective practitioner

Non-existent or non-responsive professional development	Strengthen LEAs' implementation of existing evaluation and support systems to ensure a fair, consistent process and the individualization of professional development to address noted areas for improvement
Negative school climate or environment	Provide support for LEAs to adjust staffing structures to integrate career pathways and leadership development opportunities to advance and retain excellent educators
Lack of quality or consistency of leadership	

F. Timelines and Interim Targets. If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the SEA's timelines and interim targets for eliminating **all** differences in rates.

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Key Stakeholders</i>
Recruitment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide LEAs a web-based recruitment platform with application, outreach, and data collection and tracking functions; teacher candidates will be able to develop a professional profile, view and filter active job postings, and apply for multiple positions through the single sign-on platform (SY 2017-18) • Convene rural LEA superintendents (and other school and district leaders) to facilitate the development of recruitment strategies that address challenges specific to their geographic and economic contexts (SY 2017-18) • Implement and sustain a Recruitment and Retention Campaign focused on reframing the public narrative around being a teacher in Indiana (SY 2017-18) • Support multiple avenues for LEAs to build a pipeline of educators in their local communities through coursework that enables students in these pathways to begin post-secondary study with a strong foundation in education and potential to receive college credit in their major (ongoing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education pathways course enrollment and completion • Educator preparation program enrollment and completion • Educator licensing – emergency permits • Educator applicants and vacancies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness • IDOE Office of PK-16 Academics • IDOE Office of Educator Preparation • IDOE Office of Communications • IDOE Office of Digital Media • Educator associations (superintendents, principals, teachers) • LEA administrators (HR, curriculum)

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Key Stakeholders</i>
Preparation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance and facilitation for the identification of LEA needs, including shortage areas and instructional priorities; alignment of coursework with clinical experiences to address the needs of all students; and analysis of student achievement and growth and educator evaluation data (SY 2018-19) • Support LEAs and EPP providers with the development of extended clinical experiences to provide pre-service teachers with effective teaching skills (SY 2018-19) • Provide technical assistance for diversifying clinical experience placements, training cooperating teachers to ensure levels of effectiveness, and expanding field experiences prior to student teaching to include more opportunities for low-stakes practice (SY 2018-19) • Articulate core competencies for pre-service and novice educators that are reliably predictive of driving positive student outcomes by learning from the state's most highly effective teachers across a diversity of contexts, including State Teachers of the Year and Milken Educators (SY 2018-19) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Novice teacher retention • Novice teacher effectiveness • Principal and novice teacher surveys (HEA 1388) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness • IDOE Office of Educator Preparation • State Teachers of the Year and Milken Educators • Educator preparation program providers (traditional and alternative) • LEA administrators • Commission for Higher Education • Urban League

The combination of activities listed above will decrease gaps in access to excellent educators.

	<i>Disproportionality of Teacher Assignment for Students from Low-income Families in Title I Schools</i>		
	Ineffective	Out-of-Field	Inexperienced
Baseline (2017)	3.7	1.15	1.54
Interim Target (2020)	2.8	0.86	1.16
Long- Term Goal (2023)	1.9	0.58	0.77

	<i>Disproportionality of Teacher Assignment for Students of Color in Title I Schools</i>		
	Ineffective	Out-of-Field	Inexperienced
Baseline (2017)	8.5	1.15	1.63
Interim Target (2020)	6.4	0.86	1.22
Long- Term Goal (2023)	4.3	0.58	0.82


<i>Activities</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Key Stakeholders</i>
Induction		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate a professional learning module (PLM) that supports LEAs in cultivating capable instructional mentors (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) Assist LEAs with the development of communities of practice for beginning teachers facilitated by mentors and guided by professional teaching standards, State Academic Standards, and locally-identified instructional priorities (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novice teacher retention Novice teacher effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness LEA administrators and teachers
Evaluation & Support		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move beyond reviews for superficial compliance to responding to such reviews with support for LEAs in their development and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation and support system (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) Revise the LEA Title II, Part A application to include questions related to the articulation of how LEAs use evaluation data to drive professional development paid through these funds (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) Support LEAs in aligning and layering existing State and local funding with the federal funds to ensure that professional development plans are well articulated in accordance with the district's comprehensive needs assessment and evaluation and support system data (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA staff performance evaluation plans Title II, Part A applications Educator effectiveness ratings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness IDOE Office of Title Grants and Support Educator associations (principals, teachers) Education service centers LEA administrators, including federal programs Educator preparation program providers – administrative licensure

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Key Stakeholders</i>
Advancement & Retention		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote LEAs' use of tools collaboratively developed with the REL Midwest Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance to: help teachers understand the key competencies, skills, and traits needed to serve in a leadership capacity; and help leaders ensure that the district and schools have structures, processes, and mindsets in place to implement a teacher leadership initiative (<i>SY 2018-19</i>) • Provide opportunities for teacher leadership in action, such as through state-level Powered by Teach to Lead Summits (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) • Facilitate LEAs' implementation of instructional culture audits and their development of action plans to utilize audit results to improve culture, provide targeted professional development, and identify leadership priorities (<i>SY 2017-18</i>) • Provide annual and ongoing training for evaluators in the areas of stakeholder engagement, observation and feedback cycles, and continuous improvement (<i>SY 2018-19</i>) • Select a training provider for teacher and school leaders on the development of professional learning approaches that are proven effective for changing adult practices in accordance with the following evidence-based criteria (<i>SY 2018-19</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance surveys • Summit participation • Instructional culture audit results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness • Educator associations (HR, principals, teachers) • LEA administrators and teachers

Section 6: Supporting All Students

Vision Statement: Working Together for the Success of the Whole Student

Mission Statement: Indiana will purposefully meet the unique needs of the whole student through effective partnerships in order to provide a flexible, equitable, and culturally responsive learning environment.



Indiana children arrive to school with many strengths and a wide variety of needs making their academic success dependent upon multiple stakeholders utilizing an array of strategies and resources to support the academic, social and emotional, health and wellness, and environmental needs of the whole child. Our very diverse student population is represented by numerous cultures, ethnicities, languages, and family dynamics that impact teaching and learning throughout our State. Some students are learning English for the first time, while others need additional support to address cognitive and health-related disabilities. Children who excel need systems that support their ability to realize their gifted potential. And a strong start for our early learners is vital for students' initial and sustained success across their educational experience. While such needs are not uncommon to other states, the overarching presence of poverty plays an important role in the ability of Indiana families and communities to address important needs, such as quality childcare, mental health, and access to resources for postsecondary opportunities.

Because of their existing resources and direct access to children and families, schools are well positioned to serve as a hub for communities to address the needs of the whole student. Indiana believes that through a coordinated system of resources, stakeholders, and partnerships, our schools can target the needs of all students, PK-12, by working together for student success. The outcome of this partnership will result in a

system that stresses high expectations for all students, while collaboratively working to better meet the unique needs of the students we serve.

The preceding sections of Indiana’s ESSA plan are vital for schools to ensure that they can work together for the success of the whole student. Educators need valuable academic information through an effective assessment system to respond to the various learning needs. High quality staff that are equitably distributed across the state must be adequately prepared to address the unique needs of students, such as English learners, students with disabilities, high ability students, and students needing additional academic support. Meaningful accountability systems must provide information for local and State systems to target and maximize resources while highlighting areas of strength. Lastly, all students deserve the opportunity to attend a high-quality school, and this plan will ensure that struggling public schools will receive the support they need in order to become successful.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) shall develop resources and technical assistance so local, regional, and State-level stakeholders can fulfill the shared vision of working together for the success of whole student.

Diverse School Settings

The IDOE is committed to supporting all students in Indiana regardless of the type of school they attend. It is important, therefore, to name and identify the diverse categories of schools we serve.

Traditional Public Schools

The vast majority of Indiana students, over 88 percent in school year 2016-2017, are enrolled in traditional public schools. The network of traditional public school educators, principals, superintendents, and other staff are vital to the vision of working together for the success of the whole student. Well-rounded academic, social-emotional, health and wellness, and environmental services are provided to traditional public school students and their families.

Charter Schools

As of the 2016-2017 school year, 95 charter schools serve nearly 44,000 students in Indiana. The IDOE leverages the relationships with existing high-quality charter school programs, charter school authorizers, and related State agencies such as the Indiana Charter School Board (ICSB) and Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) to ensure students attending charter schools have equitable access to meet challenging State Academic Standards and Career and Technical Education (CTE) standards. Indiana’s growing numbers of charter schools are required by law to report student achievement data to IDOE to ensure students are on a track to success.

Indiana’s innovation and corresponding accountability for charter schools has created an environment in which the unique needs of our diverse student population can be met in an equitable manner. The expansion of high-quality and innovative programming have led to charter school networks that are designed to meet the needs of adult high school students, students with disabilities, students from rural and low-income communities, and English learners. Additionally, students in Indiana are served by several virtual charter schools that are able to reach a larger population of students with online programming that better meets their needs.

Non-Public Schools

Several programs under ESSA require equitable services for nonpublic students and the IDOE remains fully committed to ensuring equitability between services for eligible public and private school students, educators and families. Across all relevant programs, the IDOE conducts regular trainings and develops resources for public and private schools to effectively implement these federal programs and services.

Indiana is committed to providing all children access to quality education opportunities. Our Choice Scholarship Program, commonly referred to as the voucher program (authorized under IC 20-51-1 and IC 20-51-4), provides scholarships to eligible Indiana students to offset tuition costs at participating nonpublic schools. Students must satisfy both household income requirements and student eligibility criteria to qualify. Participating schools and interested parents work together to enroll students and to submit Choice Scholarship applications to the Indiana Department of Education for approval and tuition awards. For the 2016-2017 school year, 313 schools and over 34,000 students participated in the Choice Scholarship Program, with over 142 million dollars in awards provided on behalf of Choice Scholarship students.

Higher Education

The IDOE believes that as a state, Indiana must consider a child's full education – from preschool through postsecondary attainment - when making policy decisions. Accordingly, the IDOE is committed to deepening the partnership with the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

To meet the demands of the new economy, more Hoosiers than ever before must earn a postsecondary credential. Indiana's higher education attainment goal calls for 60 percent of working-age adults to have a high-quality postsecondary degree or certificate by 2025. For the past several years, higher education policy in Indiana has focused on reaching this attainment goal, but success in college requires a student's academic preparation to begin as early as possible. Indiana is committed to closing the achievement gap and to ensuring that more students graduate from high school college- and career-ready. Increasing the number of students who meet Indiana's challenging academic standards will make sure Hoosiers have the preparation needed to succeed after high school.

College and Career Readiness

As part of the process that led to the creation of Indiana's College and Career Ready Standards in 2014, the State of Indiana developed a definition for what it meant for a student to be college and career ready. This definition was agreed upon by a diverse set of stakeholders, including the Indiana Education Roundtable, IDOE, Center for Education & Career Innovation (now the INSBOE staff), Commission for Higher Education and the Department of Workforce Development.

“College and career ready” means an individual has the knowledge, skills and abilities to succeed in post-secondary education and economically-viable career opportunities. Additionally, Public Law 31-2014 [SEA 91] defines college and career readiness educational standards as “the standards that a high school graduate must meet to obtain the requisite knowledge and skill to transition without remediation to post-secondary education or training, and ultimately into a sustainable career.”

6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students.

Instructions: When addressing the State's strategies below, each SEA must describe how it will use Title IV, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of fund provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies and LEA use of funds. The strategies and uses of funds must be designed to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.

The descriptions that an SEA provides must include how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the following specific subgroups of students:

- Low-income students;
 - Lowest-achieving students;
 - English learners;
 - Children with disabilities;
 - Children and youth in foster care;
 - Migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school;
 - Homeless children and youths;
 - Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students identified under Title I, Part D of the ESEA, including students in juvenile justice facilities;
 - Immigrant children and youth;
 - Students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School program under section 5221 of the ESEA; and
 - American Indian and Alaska Native students.
- A. The State's strategies and how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student's education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out; and

IDOE offers resources to assist LEAs in providing a smooth transition from middle to high school. These resources include, but are not limited to: a transition presentation for students and parents, which includes a thorough explanation of diploma and assessment requirements; a roadmap of recommended expectations/activities and academic, postsecondary and social-emotional competencies by grade level spans; and the Indiana School Counseling Competencies, which address the academic, college/career, and social-emotional developmental needs of students.

In addition, afterschool and summer programs assist students and parents with transition years in the PK-12 continuum, supporting on time promotion, connecting students to career interests and pathways, and building the engagement that decreases the drop-out rate.

Indiana requires that all sixth graders create an initial graduation plan. This plan is then required to be updated in grade 9 and every year thereafter through the completion of high school. The SEA and its partner agencies have created an online graduation plan and resources to assist schools in the completion of this task. Additionally, grade-level resource guides are available to assist School Counselors and schools (targeting specifically professionals new(er) to the field). Finally, a resource is available to assist schools working with English learners to provide guidance around appropriately offering credit toward graduation, placing students in appropriate grade levels and courses with support, and developing college and career readiness.

Early Learning

As supported by the research, high-quality early learning experiences have a critical impact on the future success of children. Findings show that early experiences are highly impactful, in part, because of the rapid rate of brain development that occurs in the early years. By age five, the vast majority of a child's brain capacity is developed. These early experiences can lessen or close the achievement gap. This is especially true for low-income students. Strengthening the alignment between the birth-to-five systems and the kindergarten-to-third grade systems will solidify fundamental development in social emotional learning, literacy, and math.

Less than five percent of Indiana four year olds have access to State-funded pre-kindergarten. This deficit presents a challenge at kindergarten entry as many students arrive unprepared with the pre-readiness skills and experiences that enable successful learning. Increased statewide access to the expansion of high-quality pre-kindergarten opportunities will improve school readiness, and a comprehensive picture of the available early learning opportunities for four year olds will provide a baseline connection between access and readiness. Increased outreach and marketing for schools to participate in the newly expanded State-funded pre-K programs -- while encouraging the development of high-quality pre-K through other funding streams, such as Title I and the Childcare Development Fund (CCDF) -- will increase equitable access for more students' experiences in high quality early childhood education.

The IDOE will collaborate with the Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) and the FSSA Office of Early Childhood and Out-of-School Learning to support the below initiatives:

- Measure percentage of students enrolled in pre-K and percentage of low-income students enrolled in pre-K;
- Measure percentage of pre-K students enrolled in a top-rated pre-K program (i.e., programs rated as Level 3 or 4 on the State's quality rating and improvement system); and
- Measure the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) ratings for school-based pre-K programs.

IDOE recognizes a strong foundation in the early years equips a child for a lifetime of success and high quality preschool programming leads to school readiness. The Department facilitated the development of Indiana's early learning and development framework to guide educators and families. The framework supports transitions from early childhood education to elementary school by aligning the Early Learning Foundations with the Indiana Academic Standards. The 2015 revision of the Foundations was based on research, feedback from practitioners, and work from professionals with expertise in each specialized area. The Foundations provide the core elements that children should achieve from birth to age five in order to be ready for future success. They also create common language and expectations for the early childhood field to support teachers, parents, caregivers, and other professionals as they develop appropriate experiences for young children. The Foundations are integrated into the early childhood system through Indiana's quality rating and improvement system, Paths to QUALITY™.

A derivative of Indiana's Early Learning Foundations, Indiana Standards Tool for Alternative Reporting of Kindergarten Readiness (ISTAR-KR) is aligned to the Indiana Academic Standards for kindergarten in the areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics and includes three functional areas: physical; personal care; and social-emotional skills. The observation-based tool is used by community and public preschool programs. The assessment can be used to determine which skills a student has mastered and identify areas of continued focus. Data collected with this tool is attached to a student's cumulative assessment record and is accessible by the kindergarten teacher. Data from *ISTAR-KR* assessments are used for State reporting for PK students. Studies show support for children and families during the transition to kindergarten may lead to academic gains in kindergarten. In addition to supporting transition collaboration among school and community-based programs, including Head Start programs, LEAs will receive guidance on evidence-based transition practices, activities, and key strategies supported by the IDOE.

Supporting Transitions for Students with Disabilities

In order to support students with disabilities, Indiana applied for and received a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) through the U.S. Department of Education. The third goal of this grant is “to improve school transitions and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities through partnerships and collaborations among schools, community agencies, higher education and families in a lifespan system of support.” An objective of this goal is *“Improved alignment across transition points of the lifespan”* and includes gathering input from representatives of school districts, State agencies and families to collaboratively analyze vertical alignment for transition, identify gaps and create an action plan. This alignment will start with preschool and end with the student transitioning out of school into adult life. The representatives will review data sources and identify strengths and gaps at the various transition points. An action plan with prioritized activities will be developed, including revisions to policies and procedures that may impede or strengthen collaboration, communication and expectations. The ultimate goal will be to ensure families have appropriate information prior to the next transition point as well as information to begin visioning for a viable future for their child through understanding the various community and State systems and curricular expectations for each level.

Transitioning from High School to Postsecondary

In order to address transition from high school to postsecondary education and careers, IDOE is a partner agency with the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration, Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services to facilitate the coordination of transition services for students with disabilities. This partnership is memorialized through a Memorandum of Understanding which includes the following principles:

- Students with disabilities upon exit from school will be prepared for competitive, integrated employment with access to necessary support services; or will be prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary training;
- Work and learning opportunities offered will be in alignment with the abilities, interests and informed choice of students, which may change over time;
- Students will have access to training and services designed to prepare them to live and function in domestic, recreational, social, community and vocational environments in integrated community based settings;
- Students will have access to pre-employment transition services, as defined by the Workforce and Innovation and Opportunity Act;
- Interagency cooperation and collaboration will focus on eligible students, ages 14-22;
- Prior to exit from secondary school, each Partner Agency will identify any and all transition services necessary for students to successfully move to the next service delivery system, as applicable. To the extent possible, the planning documents of all Partner Agencies (IEP, 504, IPE) will be integrated in terms of having the same post-secondary training and/or competitive, integrated employment goal with identified non-duplicative activities, supports and services that are mutually supportive of that goal. The Partner Agencies will consult and provide technical assistance to assist local educational agencies in identifying appropriate services and resources; and
- Supporting this school-to-adult life initiative is a statewide stakeholder group with representatives from IDOE, the Department of Workforce Development, Commission for Higher Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, parents of students with disabilities, mental health providers, employment providers, employers, Department of Corrections, special interest groups, post-secondary institutions, State Department of Health, and a technical assistance center located at Indiana University with a focus on transition from school to work. This group reviews transition policies and practices and makes recommendations to the aforementioned listed Partner Agencies.

Pathways to Postsecondary

Indiana students have an extraordinary opportunity to participate in a variety of pathways that lead to education and training beyond high school. We are committed to setting students up for success by expanding and increasing the rigor of advanced placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and dual credit programs throughout local schools and LEAs in Indiana. The State is also committed to providing quality

career and technical education (CTE) through career pathways. Many of these career pathways lead to a valuable industry certification and all pathways have support from local business and industry partners. Students connect pathway experiences to the workplace and build employability skills through work-based learning experiences. Early postsecondary opportunities available in Indiana, that align with the college and career readiness indicator in the accountability system, include:

- Advanced Placement (AP)
- International Baccalaureate (IB)
- Dual Credit (DC)
- Industry Certification (IC)
- Work Based Learning (WBL)

Dual Credit and Advanced Placement

In Indiana, dual credit represents courses in which students have the opportunity to earn both high school and college credits through the same coursework. Dual credit courses are taught by high school faculty, college faculty, or adjunct college faculty either at the high school, at the college or university, or sometimes through online courses or distance education. Dual credit is offered by both State and independent colleges and universities. Indiana law requires high schools to offer a minimum of two dual credit courses with the intent of expanding opportunities for students to take college-level coursework while in high school. The IDOE has worked with the Indiana Commission for Higher Education to create the Priority Dual Credit and Technical Dual Credit Crosswalks that are used to provide guidance to schools, parents, and students regarding coursework, graduation, and postsecondary planning. The Dual Credit crosswalks provide schools with the designated IDOE coursework that directly correlates to the postsecondary institution and the maximum credits that can be earned for each course through the formal dual credit agreement.

For Advanced Placement (AP), the determination for whether or not a student earns college credit is based on the score they earn on the Advanced Placement exam, which is administered by the College Board. Advanced Placement courses can meet both graduation and elective requirements. There is an exam fee required, but there is fee assistance for low-income students. Over 70 high schools in Indiana had over 25 percent of their student population earn college credit through Advanced Placement courses.

Industry Certifications

The Indiana College and Career Pathways provide an aligned sequence of secondary and postsecondary courses leading to an industry-recognized credential, technical certification, or an associate or baccalaureate degree at an accredited postsecondary institution for careers that are high wage or high demand in Indiana. Indiana's college and career clusters shown below.

<u>Indiana's College and Career Clusters</u>	
Agriculture	Architecture & Construction
Arts, AV Technology & Communication	Business & Marketing
Hospitality & Human Services	Health Sciences
Education & Training	Information Technology
Manufacturing	Public Safety

STEM	Transportation
------	----------------

Industry certifications are an important assessment of a student's technical skill and mastery within a specific program of study. Industry certification attainment has also steadily increased since 2013. In 2014-2015, 54 percent of CTE Concentrators (students earning four or more technical credits in a Career Cluster, at least one of which is a completer course) left high school with an industry certification. Over \$1.3 Million were spent in Industry Certifications during fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

In many instances industry-recognized certifications serve as the pathway assessment or capstone component of a College and Career Pathway. Additionally, certifications serve as a component of Indiana's Technical Honors Diploma, which further incentivizes students. Panels consisting of industry representatives, secondary and postsecondary teachers, and other stakeholders routinely review their respective subject areas to ensure that the most up-to-date certifications are added to Indiana's list of recognized credentials.



58


Work-based Learning

Indiana students participate in work-based learning through embedded experiences in career and technical education programs and stand-alone programs that create flexibility to meet the needs of all students and all schools. The continuum of work-based learning is integrated into meaningful experiences for students at all levels. Career awareness and exploration activities start at the elementary level and are greatly expanded during middle school grades.

Students participating in activities at the career preparation level complete a portfolio reflecting the experience and are guided by a content standards-based training plan. The plan provides a guideline for students gaining employability skills along with knowledge and technical skills in a career pathway. Students help create the plan in collaboration with their classroom teacher, host site supervisor or mentor, and with approval from parents or guardians when possible. This creates a collaborative initiative to guide student learning in the experience.


Additionally, funding is utilized to provide support for career and technical education (CTE) teachers and counselors in industry. The program provides professional development for teachers and counselors to explore industry opportunities in their communities while utilizing best practices in work-based learning. Teachers will develop resources to share through networks of work-based learning instructors.

⁵⁸ <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/cte/17-state-cte-career-readiness-report-final-3-3-17.pdf>



- B.** The State’s strategies and how it will support LEAs to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented. Such subjects could include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, or physical education.

Holding all students accountable for a high level of achievement is a shared responsibility. Providing equitable access to challenging State Standards for all students, including students of both genders, minority students, English learners, students with disabilities, and low-income students requires a system of equitable access to a robust core curriculum based on the challenging State Standards and high quality instruction that is designed to meet the unique needs of students. Collaboration between professionals, parents and community agencies is a key component in determining and providing appropriate support to students, including those who struggle and those who excel. Appropriate, ongoing, and unbiased assessment is necessary to determine whether equitable access has been achieved. These key components provided within a multi-tiered system of support and through adopting Universal Design principles will provide the framework that allows every student to succeed. The following Every Student Succeeds framework operationalizes the key components that allow all students the opportunity to meet challenging State Standards.



Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

Indiana has incorporated UDL into assessment; however, to fully support the tenets of the framework, Indiana must operationalize the initiative. This will require the development of policy and guidance as well as technical assistance and training for local education agencies and all educators. In order for UDL to be effective, educators beyond those identified as special education teachers and staff must be familiar with the processes and strategies of this framework.

UDL is an educational framework based on research in the learning sciences, including cognitive neuroscience, that guides the development of flexible learning environments that can accommodate individual learning differences. Recognizing that the way individuals learn can be unique, the UDL framework calls for creating curriculum from the outset that provides:

- *Multiple means of representation* to give learners various ways of acquiring information and knowledge;
- *Multiple means of expression* to provide learners alternatives for demonstrating what they know; and
- *Multiple means of engagement* to tap into learners' interests, challenge them appropriately, and motivate them to learn.

Curriculum, as defined in the UDL literature, has four parts: instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments. UDL is intended to increase access to learning by reducing physical, cognitive, intellectual, and organizational barriers to learning, as well as other obstacles. UDL principles also lend themselves to implementing inclusionary practices in the classroom.

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)

Indiana's vision for a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is to provide academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support, grounded in culturally responsive practices, to all students. MTSS is not a program or an

initiative, rather, an overarching framework for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional instruction and intervention. Indiana has developed guidance for academic and behavioral support and is currently expanding this draft to include a social-emotional component. The current guidance includes a multi-tiered approach to the early identification and support of students with learning and behavioral needs across the pre-K to 12 continuum. The process begins with high-quality instruction and universal screening of all children in the general education classroom. This strengths-based model systematically identifies and provides ALL students with the supports they need to succeed. MTSS is a comprehensive framework for continuous school improvement that uses data-based decision making, monitoring, and ongoing measurement, monitoring and evaluation of standards implementation and outcomes. Guidance for Indiana's MTSS vision is in the process of being developed for educators, parents and community partners, including the use of federal funding to carry out MTSS initiatives.

Indiana's guiding principles for MTSS:

- MTSS is for ALL children and ALL educators, including classroom and support teachers, support staff, counselors, social workers, and administrators;
- MTSS requires an emphasis on the whole child and the strengths and challenges students exhibit related to overall achievement;
- Academics, behavior, social-emotional development as well as physical and nutritional health and other factors can all play a role in a student's school success;
- MTSS must emphasize college and/or career readiness for ALL students;
- MTSS must be driven by district, school, and teacher leadership;
- MTSS must be incorporated in school improvement initiatives and plans; and
- MTSS must support and provide value to effective, culturally responsive practices.

MTSS success lies within the classroom through collaboration and job-embedded professional development. It supports and emphasizes the use of multiple and varied formative assessments to drive instructional practices. When implementing an MTSS system, data disaggregated by race, gender, and disability are key to determining whether supports are benefitting all groups equally. It is an all-encompassing system that addresses all students' needs versus a pre-packaged solution.


It is the intention of the IDOE to provide professional development and support to LEAs as MTSS becomes the primary structure for teaching and learning. Indiana is incorporating the "Interconnected System Framework (ISF) Mental Health Framework for Schools" into its MTSS structure. The ISF mental health framework is an essential component of MTSS due to its focus upon the related mental health needs that impact student achievement.

The core features of ISF include -

- Effective teams that include community mental health providers
- Data-based decision-making
- Formal processes for the selection and implementation of evidence-based practices
- Early access through use of comprehensive screening
- Rigorous progress monitoring for both fidelity and effectiveness
- On-going coaching at both systems and practices levels

School Mental Health Framework

Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)



The Interconnected System Framework is supported through the newly formed Indiana School Mental Health Initiative within the Indiana Resource Center for Autism at Indiana University. The shared goal is to ensure that all of Indiana's students are mentally and emotionally healthy so they are both ready to learn and can achieve their full potential. The initiative aims to provide guidance, resources, trainings, and coaching to aid schools and their community partners in providing a continuum-of-care that addresses everything from prevention through crisis intervention in an integrated way that focuses on all barriers to student learning. In recognizing that schools cannot do this alone, a primary emphasis will also be to help develop partnerships at the community, regional, and State levels.

System of Care

In addition to the MTSS framework within schools, there is a larger Indiana System of Care (IN-SOC) statewide initiative. The IDOE has developed a collaborative partnership with IN-SOC and is a voting member of this State-level governance board. This initiative, hosted by the Indiana Department of Mental Health, has overall, long-term strategic goals:

- Develop and endorse a single, statewide definition and application of a comprehensive, effective, SOC for youth and families in Indiana;
- Establish a board, including statewide representation, which will ultimately provide the leadership, policy recommendations, and technical assistance needed to support communities in developing and sustaining their local SOC;
- Decrease barriers to service delivery and the feeling of service silos for families trying to access mental health treatment services for youth in their communities;
- Increase the availability and utilization of evidenced-based practices to promote positive youth and

- family outcomes;
- Increase cultural and linguistic competency in service delivery and reduce disparities in access, service use, and outcomes;
- Identify and fill gaps in service and additional behavioral health needs for all youth;
- Increase provider and agency accountability to the youth and families served;
- Increase the number of and access to local family and peer support groups and programs within communities; and
- Develop a comprehensive evaluation plan to monitor outcomes and SOC progress in order to create a feedback loop for system and performance improvement.

Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

The emphasis placed on equal access to curriculum by all students and the accountability required by IDEA 2004 and the ESSA has presented a need for a practice that will accommodate all learners. Indiana's Content Connectors, which are alternate standards that have been developed for students with significant cognitive disabilities, are aligned with Indiana's Academic Standards. The Office of Special Education helps to fund various resource centers that provide technical assistance to schools and LEAs to help align their curriculum to these alternate standards.

The Office of Special Education (OSE) helps to fund INSOURCE, Indiana's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center. INSOURCE provides Indiana families and service providers the information and training necessary to ensure effective educational programs and appropriate services for children and young adults with disabilities. INSOURCE is a member of the Office of Special Education's Indiana Resource Network (IRN). Indiana is the only state that houses a PTI liaison in the state department offices (since 2009). The liaison serves on numerous work groups and committees as the parent representative and is an integral member of the OSE team. This strategy has proven to be an effective means of communication and collaboration between parents and the IDOE.

The Office of Special Education provides information on its website to advise parents, schools, and the public of State and federal special education requirements. This includes information for parents about requesting an educational evaluation if a disability is suspected. Indiana's special education regulations are posted, as well as "Navigating the Course," a parent-friendly document that provides guidance to parents and parent advocates. The IDOE has a memorandum of understanding with First Steps, Indiana's Part C provider of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities, to facilitate the transition of students from Part C to the Part B program for children ages 3-21 with disabilities. The IDOE also has a working relationship with the Department of Child Services (DCS). The Office of Special Education regularly meets with DCS education liaisons to address concerns related to students with disabilities who are placed in foster care or residential facilities by DCS. The Office of Special Education provides information and support to schools concerning referrals and evaluations and provides a sample notice of procedural safeguards. Collaboration with Indiana IEP Resource Center, one of our Indiana Resource Network Resource Centers, provides additional information and training for schools to use in conducting appropriate educational evaluations. In November 2016, OSE updated the criteria for determining participation in Indiana's alternate assessment (ISTAR).⁵⁹

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP, OSEP, Indicator 17) is a coordinated plan that was developed as a part of an overarching requirement for states to address specific needs of students with disabilities. This plan was designed, refined, and improved with support from multiple internal and external stakeholders over a period of time. The Indiana SSIP goal is to increase reading achievement as measured with Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment by at least .5 percent each year for 3rd grade students with disabilities. Collaboration and coordination across the offices within the department through SSIP partnerships provide an opportunity to

⁵⁹ <http://www.doe.in.gov/assessment/alternate-assessments>

offer targeted assistance and supports to teachers and students with an emphasis on students with disabilities and students who struggle.

English Learners

Indiana is home to over 50,000 students who speak another language and are in need of additional support to perform well in English. Indiana adopted the WIDA English Language Development Standards in 2013 as the State college and career ready English language development standards for English learners. The WIDA ELD Standards work in conjunction with the Indiana college and career ready academic standards to ensure that English learners are provided with the supports they need to access grade and age-appropriate content standards, regardless of their level of English proficiency. All teachers who work with English learners, including content-area staff and EL staff, are held accountable to the implementation of the WIDA ELD Standards. The IDOE has provided extensive training for LEAs on the implementation of the WIDA ELD Standards and requires that LEAs incorporate the ELD Standards in their required annual English learner plan submission. Implementation of the WIDA ELD Standards is also monitored through consolidated and federal programs monitoring, and through the Title III application process so that English learners may attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging Indiana academic content and achievement standards as all children are expected to meet.

Additionally, IDOE policies for English learner equity align with Department of Justice and Office of Civil Rights policies regarding the inclusion of English learners in all curricular and extracurricular programming, translation support for families who speak a language other than English, age-appropriate grade and class placement, and identification and instruction of English learners with additional academic needs.

In order to accurately identify potential English learners, the Indiana Home Language Survey is administered to all students upon their initial enrollment in Indiana schools. Students with any language other than English included on their Home Language Survey are then screened for initial English language proficiency using an English language proficiency (ELP) screener. Students who score below the state-determined proficient score on the ELP screener are considered to be English learners. LEAs are required to report all enrolled language minority students, including ELs and former ELs, to the IDOE annually. All students identified as English learners are assessed annually for English language proficiency. Students who score at or above the state-determined proficiency score on the annual ELP exam are reclassified as fluent and enter a rigorous monitoring period before permanently exiting EL programming.

High Ability Students

Currently, per Indiana State Code (IC 20-36-2), dollars are provided for a state resource grant program. These funds are utilized to develop local programs for High Ability students. The funds provide state integrated services that include information in materials, professional development plans and programs, research and development services, technical assistance for student assessments and program assessments, program development, and implementation. The funds also support educators pursuing professional development leading to endorsement or licensure in High Ability Education. Dollars appropriated to school districts are determined by the IDOE based on a set minimum amount increased by each student in the program. The school district's program is aligned with strategic and continuous school improvement and achievement plans (IC 20-31-5-4). The school that receives a grant under the subsection will submit an annual report to IDOE that includes the following: the programs for which the grant is used; and the results of the programs, including student general assessment results, program effectiveness or student achievement.

Indiana requires the High Ability Program to include: 1) a broad-based planning committee that meets regularly to review the local education authority's plan for High Ability; 2) student assessments that identify High Ability students using multifaceted assessments. The assessments must identify students with high abilities in the general intellectual domain and specific academic domains; 3) Professional development; 4) Development and implementation of local services for High Ability students, including an appropriately

differentiated curriculum and instruction in the core academic areas; 5) Evaluation of the local program for High Ability students; and 6) best practices to increase the number of participants in high ability and underrepresented populations.

In order to improve equitable access to high ability programming, the IDOE will encourage census testing, which is the testing all students in the grade level, with an aptitude measure at multiple grade levels. Improved measures of assessment would ensure that students, including those from underrepresented populations, would have the opportunity to take the measure of aptitude regardless of their achievement levels. High Ability students from underrepresented populations in primary grades may have lower than expected achievement due to a lack of opportunity to learn. When provided the appropriate curriculum and instruction, their achievement levels can quickly rise to be commensurate with their high ability. Census testing with an aptitude measure would also allow twice exceptional students, (students who are both high ability and have a learning disability) to be identified, as their performance on an aptitude measure is less likely to be affected by their learning disability than their performance on an achievement test would be.

Minority Students

The IDOE is committed to providing an equitable education to all student groups, including American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Students with disabilities, English learners, and students on free/reduced price meals. Indiana's ESSA plan provides disaggregated long-term goals for all student groups so that schools and LEAs will address achievement and opportunity gaps presented within specific student groups. Additionally, the Supporting Excellent Educators section focuses upon the access of excellent educators for specific student groups so that all children have equitable access to effective teachers. Minority children enrolled in schools where student groups are significantly underperforming will receive support through the IDOE's school improvement division, as a part of its targeted or comprehensive support and improvement strategies to address inequities through evidence-based guidance and tools.

Foster Children and Youth

The IDOE works collaboratively with the Indiana Department of Child Services (DCS) and LEAs to address the numerous challenges that children in foster care face with regard to their education. DCS has identified a State point of contact, along with regional Educational Liaisons (ELs), to partner with the LEAs and IDOE foster care points of contact to promote stability and continuity in education with foster children. Through the use of joint guidance and a collaborative working relationship, decisions regarding educational placement and supportive services are tailored to the specific needs of each foster child.

Specifically, a "Checklist for Point of Contact Decision Making" has been developed by DCS to guide the evaluation of educational best interest for foster children within the LEA. Traditional barriers to educating foster children, such as transportation of students across district lines, immediate enrollment, and sharing of school records, among others, are proactively addressed through ESSA. The IDOE has named a Foster Youth Coordinator to facilitate inter-agency efforts that support foster children. The department has also released LEA guidance to ensure that, through Title I plans, barriers related to enrollment, transportation, and agency coordination are reduced. In addition, a data share is being developed between the IDOE and DCS, to allow for the easy access to basic child-specific information required for educational decision making and statistical data for ongoing program evaluation. The SEA foster care point of contact will also provide necessary support to LEAs, guidance communication, and training.

Nutrition

IDOE School and Community Nutrition (SCN) staff administer the USDA Child Nutrition Programs including the National School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast Program, the Afterschool Snack Program, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the Summer Food Service Program, the Special Milk Program, the Food Distribution Program, the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program and Team Nutrition.

Afterschool and summer learning settings play an essential role in the delivery of programming about healthy eating. These programs are designed to provide healthy meals and nutrition education to improve the meals and nutritional awareness of Hoosier children.

SCN staff also provides a wide variety of training opportunities for school LEA food service staff to improve their knowledge of nutrition, their culinary skills, and promote food safety. Providing this training and technical assistance supports the schools in providing healthy meals to students and helps students to develop lifelong healthy eating habits.

School Safety

Per Indiana Code,⁶⁰ the IDOE's Division of School Building Physical Security and Safety maintains guidelines for establishing emergency response protocols, provides school safety specialist training and certification, and provides technical assistance to school administrators throughout the State of Indiana. This division disseminates resources related to school safety issues and assists school districts with reviews and updates of their safety plans, drills, and staff development.

Per Indiana Administrative Code,⁶¹ each school district shall develop a written emergency preparedness plan, to include protocols for fire, natural disaster, adverse weather conditions, nuclear contamination, exposure to chemicals, and manmade occurrences such as student disturbance, and violence. These plans must be made available for review by IDOE, and each year 30 schools are selected at random and are inspected to ensure compliance with the law. This review also provides Safety Specialists the opportunity to review best practices and compare their plan to other schools.

The Division of Building Safety and Security also coordinates the Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy, which provides information on national and State best practices, as well as exemplary resources for school safety, security, intervention, prevention, and emergency preparedness planning. School Safety Specialists are trained to lead the development and implementation of school safety practices which will provide safe educational environments for all students. Indiana Code⁶² requires every school district to have a certified School Safety Specialist, and this certification is only available through the IDOE. Recent trainings have included drug identification courses, recognizing when students are under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and the use of Narcan in cases of opioid overdose.

While a certified School Safety Specialist is required for every public school district, charter schools and private schools are exempt from this requirement. However, IDOE continues to offer this training for charters and private schools at no cost. In 2016, there were 205 certified School Safety Specialists working in private schools, and 32 certified School Safety Specialists working in charter schools.

In partnership with the Indiana State Police (ISP), the Division of School Building Physical Security and Safety provides training to address active shooter events in schools. ISP developed the Unarmed Response to Active Shooter training videos to be used by schools when training staff suggested actions during a violent event. Training modules were also developed to address active shooter and hostage events that would occur on a bus. These modules are housed on the State Police website and the IDOE website.

Per Indiana Codes,⁶³ every school district shall have a policy prohibiting bullying in their school. Schools are also required to provide bullying training to the school district's employees and volunteers who have direct, ongoing contact with students, and provide age appropriate, evidence-based instruction focusing on bullying prevention each year.

⁶⁰ Indiana Code 20-19-3-14

⁶¹ 511 IAC 6.1-2-2.5

⁶² Indiana Code 5-2-10.1-9

⁶³ Indiana Codes 20-26-5-34.2, 20-30-5-5.5, 20-33-8-0.2, 20-33-8-13.5

Various resources are provided by IDOE to schools to satisfy these requirements. Sample discipline policies are available for schools to utilize as a template to establish their local policies based upon their resources and student body. Training tools are also provided for school staff, including readymade presentation materials available for all staff, and job specific training materials for food service, clerical service, custodial service, transportation service, and volunteers. Additionally, the School Safety Specialist for each school district receives bullying training that includes information on bullying data/prevalence, and best practices for identification, prevention, and intervention of bullying incidents.

Health and Wellness

Research and scientific reviews have documented that the academic success of America's youth is strongly linked with their overall health. Many students experience tremendous adversity in their lives – including poverty, physical and mental health challenges, community violence, and family circumstances – that make it difficult for them to take advantage of the opportunity to learn at school. Positive effects on educational outcomes, as well as health-risk behaviors and health outcomes, are impacted by school health programs. Similarly, programs that are primarily designed to improve academic performance are increasingly recognized as important public health interventions that impacts overall and lifelong health and wellness. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), multiple health-related factors such as hunger, physical and emotional abuse, and chronic illness can lead to poor school performance.⁶⁴

In addition to these factors that can impact school performance, several groups of students who face significant barriers in regard to school attendance have been identified. These groups include students with chronic health conditions, students with disabilities and non-English learners.⁶⁵ The percentage of children and adolescents in the United States with chronic health conditions (CHC) increased from 1.8 percent in the 1960s to more than 25 percent in 2007.⁶⁶ Identifying students with chronic absenteeism is a priority for Indiana schools as student attendance and academic achievement are intrinsically linked. According to the U.S. Department of Education, chronic absenteeism is widespread – with over six million students across the country missing 15 or more days of school in 2013-2014. For the 2015-2016 school year, Indiana schools reported that 134,568 students were absent (excused and unexcused) for 15 days or more. This equates to approximately 11.8 percent of Indiana students who missed three weeks or more of school. This is a driving factor behind Indiana's decision to include metrics related to attendance in its accountability system.

Schools play a critical role in promoting the health and safety of young people and helping them establish lifelong healthy behavior patterns.⁶⁷ Strong evidence demonstrates the need for students to have access to programs that meet their comprehensive needs, including their mental and physical health and safety, and provide a challenging learning environment. According to SHAPE America, evidence supports a direct correlation between physical and mental health and learning, which is essential to academic success, school completion, and the development of healthy, resilient, and productive citizens.

Schools are uniquely positioned to promote student engagement and help them acquire life-long knowledge and skills through comprehensive health education, physical education/physical activity, nutrition, comprehensive school mental and behavioral health services, counseling and integration among all education and health programs.⁶⁸ The IDOE strives to achieve its vision of fostering healthy, safe, and supportive environments that support student physical, social, and emotional development as well as student achievement and attendance. Schools can impact the health and well-being of students by advocating for quality health services, having a positive influence on students' eating and physical activity behaviors, and

⁶⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Health & Academics*. [Web](#)

⁶⁵ U.S. DOE, 2016

⁶⁶ Halfon & Newacheck, 2010

⁶⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *A Collaborative Approach to Learning and Health*. [Web](#)

⁶⁸ SHAPE America. *10 Top Tools for Health and Physical Educators*. [Web](#)

providing comprehensive health and wellness programming, including afterschool and summer learning programming. All students deserve the opportunity to be healthy and successful. Providing access to health services, health and wellness programming, healthy foods and physical activity plays an important role in the academic achievement of students.

Schools can influence eating and physical activity behaviors of students. Spending much of their time at school, students may eat as many as two out of three meals per day, and may get much of their physical activity while at school. All students deserve the opportunity to be healthy and successful. Providing access to healthy foods and physical activity plays an important role in the academic achievement of students.

The schools and corporations across Indiana are unique in their needs, policies and capacity. To best support schools in providing opportunities for a well-rounded education for all students, the IDOE is dedicated to providing resources, guidance and technical assistance that enable schools to support the development of the whole child. Some of these specific resources include supporting students with chronic physical and mental health conditions, identifying students at-risk for drug use and overdose, suicide, bullying, trauma, violence or child abuse, and supporting healthy life-style choices regarding nutrition, physical activity, stress reduction and overall positive physical/social/emotional development.

Students that are not in attendance have a significant barrier to learning. Students who are at risk of being chronically absent and are in need of health services include those with long-term physical, emotional, behavioral, and developmental disorders that require prescription medications and medical or educational services. They also include disorders that affect a child's functional status⁶⁹. IDOE is committed to assisting schools with understanding when students are most at risk and helping schools better target interventions to improve student attendance and outcomes.

Although not all states have a requirement for the provision of health and physical education instruction; both subjects are required in Indiana for all grades, Kindergarten through eighth grade. Additionally, credits in both subject areas are required for graduation. Continued encouragement and technical assistance will be provided by the IDOE to schools in an effort to support these important and necessary instructional elements that contribute to a well-rounded and healthy student.

Data-driven decisions, derived from the use of comprehensive program needs assessments (i.e., School Health Index, WellSAT 2.0, Fuel Up to Play 60, etc.) and evidenced based interventions (i.e., SPARK, FitnessGram, etc.) are essential for the most comprehensive health and wellness programming. The IDOE encourages, and will continue to encourage, the use of evidence based and research driven instruction and interventions that impact health and wellness, and best fit the needs of each school/district. The flexibility and expanded uses of ESSA funding will be broadly communicated with district and program leaders so that decisions are uniquely aligned with their needs and supported by data. Support for data-driven decision making is an area where the IDOE adds value to districts and schools.

Indiana has adopted a standards-based approach to development and implementation of curriculum and instruction, based on the long tradition of local control. All Indiana students have access to rigorous academic standards, which set high expectations for academic achievement. In 2017, a team of professionals comprised of Indiana educators, post-secondary professors and community partners, collaborated with the IDOE to develop the latest edition of the Indiana Academic Standards for Physical Education and Health Education. Both sets of standards are aligned with nationally recognized standards for health and physical education. The IDOE will make available, and provide as requested, guidance and technical assistance to all schools and teachers, to assist them in the effective integration and implementation of the new standards into their instruction.

⁶⁹ Forrest, Bevans, Riley, Crespo, & Louis, 2011

Schools, parents, communities, and the IDOE share a common goal of supporting the health and academic success of students. Afterschool and summer learning programs play an essential role in promoting physical and health education. Research shows that the health of students is linked to their academic achievement. By working together, the various sectors can ensure that every Hoosier student is healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged.

Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)

In 2012, the United States Department of Labor forecasted that by 2018, Indiana would have 118,000 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) jobs to fill. The IDOE recognized that 90 percent of those jobs would require some postsecondary education, and that at that time, too few students were in programs of study that would provide skill-building in problem solving, planning, and execution to become college and career ready to fill the eventual STEM job openings. IDOE embraced the responsibility to lead Indiana in building coalitions to advance STEM education, strengthening existing programs and creating new ones to fill the STEM career pipeline. This will ensure that future STEM positions can be filled by Indiana graduates and businesses will be attracted to locate and invest in Indiana.

Indiana STEM Council

In 2017, the Indiana General Assembly appropriated resources to the IDOE in order to “develop recommendations to improve elementary and secondary student achievement and participation in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects throughout Indiana and to improve coordination among the various STEM initiatives.”⁷⁰

To accomplish this task, the IDOE formed the Indiana STEM Council. The council, which met for the first time in September 2017, is made up of the stakeholders identified by the Indiana General Assembly, including the Department of Workforce Development, the office of the governor, the Indiana Economic Development Corporation, and the business community. It also includes STEM educators and members of the non-profit and philanthropic community with STEM-focused missions.


IDOE STEM School Certification

The plan includes the IDOE STEM School Certification process, implementation rubric, and tools for schools to conduct a needs assessment and create an action plan for an LEA. Indiana STEM Framework is currently endorsed by STEMx, a national leader in STEM Education.⁷¹ Indiana currently has 32 STEM Certified Schools throughout the state that were awarded in three different cohorts.⁷² IDOE facilitates collaboration amongst STEM schools by conducting annual STEM Network Meetings where participants can share ideas and collaborate. An updated STEM Framework is currently being developed as an effort to increase the number of STEM Certified Schools in the State of Indiana.

⁷⁰ [https://www.in.gov/sba/files/AP_2017_0_0_0_HEA_1001 - The Budget Bill.pdf](https://www.in.gov/sba/files/AP_2017_0_0_0_HEA_1001_-_The_Budget_Bill.pdf)

⁷¹ <https://www.doe.in.gov/ccr/indiana-stem-education-science-technology-engineering-and-mathematics>

⁷² A map of these schools can be viewed at: <https://www.doe.in.gov/ccr/indiana%E2%80%99s-stem-certified-schools>



Social Studies

The aim of the IDOE is to play an active role in defining a well-rounded education for Indiana students as part of ESSA in order to bring social studies to life in all of our classrooms. The IDOE remains steadfast to helping students become creative and independent thinkers by guiding them in the understanding and analysis of important political, geographic, economic, civic, legal and social issues of our contemporary and historical world.

Social Studies is a vital component of a well-rounded education, as evidenced below.

- In our constitutional democracy, civic education prepares students to exercise their responsibility to participate in civic and democratic processes in a self-governing society. Effective citizens use public problem-solving skills; appreciate principles of democracy; and possess knowledge of the Constitution, federal, State, and local government, laws and the legal system, and international institutions.
- A sound economic and personal finance education equips students with the critical thinking skills required to define their goals, consider alternatives, and choose the one that best satisfies each goal as they become successful and productive adults, knowledgeable consumers, discerning decision-makers, and successful community leaders.
- Geography encourages students to think critically at several scales from local to global. A geographically literate student understands the patterns of culture over the surface of the earth and is able to solve problems that involve the location of economic, social and political functions and establishments.
- History education engages students with deep thinking about change over time, which guides learning about themselves and their world. Historical thinking skills teach students to ask thoughtful questions, analyze evidence to draw conclusions, and consider multiple perspectives to address problems both individually and collectively.

This ESSA plan will allow Indiana to support our rich social studies standards with powerful professional development and accessible resources to enhance teaching and learning as part of a well-rounded education. Social Studies professional development and resources enable teachers to advance student outcomes. Indiana teachers need professional development opportunities that provide deep content knowledge and pedagogical best practices, as well as resources to benefit student learning. Indiana's social studies organizations provide opportunities to offer top-quality professional development and resources to meet teachers' needs. Indiana's ESSA plan provides a critical opportunity to enhance social studies education to create young people ready to engage in their community, college or workplace in well-rounded ways.

Music, Arts, and Physical Education

The IDOE recognizes music, arts, and physical education not as luxuries in a child's education, but rather as important features of whole-child development from PreK-12 to postsecondary education. These areas provide positive benefits to executive function, motor skills, language development, decision making, visual learning, inventiveness, cultural awareness, physical and mental well-being, and improved academic performance. These co-curricular and extracurricular activities improve the curriculum while increasing student engagement and motivation. Based on stakeholder feedback, the IDOE will permit the use of federal funding to support these areas, where allowable, and when based upon the needs assessment of the school or LEA.

Dual Language and Immersion and Foreign Language

In Indiana, there are currently eight dual language and immersion programs that are receiving State grant funding to increase the number of students with access to dual language or immersion programming in Spanish and Mandarin. Dual language and immersion programs provide half of the instruction in English and half of the instruction in the target language, such as Spanish. Prior to the inception of these programs, four Indiana school districts locally developed these programs and have seen many benefits both cognitively and culturally for all students involved.

The IDOE will continue to support the growth of the existing State pilot programs for dual language and immersion programs and continued development for further foreign language instruction. This will require strategic support for program creation of a more diverse landscape of languages and the development of standards and State-level professional development programs. In addition, through licensing and collaboration with institutions of higher education, Indiana will begin the process of training qualified educators to be prepared to deliver high-quality bilingual instruction to students in these dual language and immersion programs.

Dual language and immersion programs produce significantly high results in closing the achievement gap for native English speakers and their non-native English-speaking classmates, due to the development of basic functions of literacy and discourse in the first language. Second language learning is vital to the development of well-rounded students by aiding their language development, cultural competency, and global experience.

- C. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce:
- i. Incidents of bullying and harassment;
 - ii. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and
 - iii. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?
- ☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

The IDOE has created various methods for educating, providing guidance materials and offering resources for LEAs in regards to school climate and safety, including bullying and harassment. The IDOE collects the number and type of bullying incidences from LEAs, as required by Indiana statute. The IDOE also houses a

School Safety Academy, with professional development opportunities offered multiple times throughout each academic year. The Academy covers the topics of bullying and harassment to better equip educators to address these issues.

Further, by providing resources and technical assistance on implementing a Multi-tiered system of support, the IDOE will assist schools in improving school conditions for student learning. This includes the reduction of incidences of bullying and harassment, the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise students' health and safety in a culturally responsive manner. The IDOE will utilize its Title IV, A technical assistance funds, and other funds as appropriate, to improve conditions for student learning through tools and resources provided to LEAs to implement positive behavior intervention systems and culturally responsive discipline practices that are not disproportionate to gender, race, and other student characteristics. The IDOE will partner with local, regional, and State entities to promote existing organizations that train educators on crisis prevention intervention to increase access to these resources and allow federal funding to be used to support related costs, such as travel or release time for educators.

IDOE's Office of Special Education (OSE) currently offers various levels of support to districts depending on the data collected annually on disproportionality with respect to discipline and bullying occurring at a higher rate for students with disabilities. Support in the form web based resources is available to all schools with more specific professional development and/or technical assistance opportunities for LEAs who report incidents of disciplining and bullying at higher rates for students with disabilities. Specific supports include:

- For the disproportionate districts, trainings are held annually for LEAs and for Mediation and Hearing Officers by the OSE and by the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) specifically addressing data, root causes analyses, Functional Behavioral Assessments, Behavior Intervention Plans, and Indiana's Article 7 discipline regulations for students with disabilities;
- The OSE investigates complaints involving bullying that result in a denial of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities and provides training to ICASE (Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education) to raise awareness of how bullying of, or by, students with disabilities could result in a denial of a FAPE and how schools should address such concerns;
- The OSE addresses discipline issues, both through complaint investigations as well as by providing professional development to school personnel, independent hearing officers, and mediators to ensure that they all understand that discipline should involve education and training to address the behavior, teach new skills or coping strategies, and otherwise address the inappropriate behaviors rather than to just remove a student from the school setting;
- For LEAs found out of compliance for Significant Disproportionality through OSE, a mandatory Significant Disproportionality Summit is held each June. Some topics of discussion at the summit include: root cause analysis, CEIS planning, culturally responsive alternatives to suspension, culturally responsive climates and cultures, and implicit bias. Corrective action plans are developed at the summit; and
- In January 2017, OSE contracted with the newly created Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center to provide technical assistance to LEAs who are disproportionately disciplining students with disabilities.

D. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students?

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

eLearning

The IDOE's Office of eLearning supports Indiana LEAs in integrating technology for the improvement of student achievement and increased digital literacy. This support is focused on working with school and district leaders to become more future-ready, increasing collaboration with and among teachers and coaches, providing flexibility for LEAs to explore innovative new programs, and delivering focused grants that support LEAs in various stages of their transition to digital teaching and learning. The strategies below have yielded great progress in our State, resulting in strong numbers for thoughtful technology integration in Indiana. More than seventy-five percent of our LEAs have 1:1 device integration at some grade level. Ninety-five percent of our LEAs have wireless deployed in all of their schools. Sixty-eight percent of LEAs have already reached the level of broadband access recommended by national organizations.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
<u>Innovation Planning Grants</u> - support for forming a plan for digital learning, researching implementation, PD	Fall, Annually	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Digital Learning Grants</u> - support districts in implementing a well-developed digital learning plan	Spring, Annually	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Summer of eLearning Conference Series</u> - sponsors 25 digital learning conferences around the State, hosting 8,500+ educators	Summer, Annually	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Digital Content Curation</u> - support teachers in the shift away from traditional textbooks	Ongoing	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Digital Citizenship Initiative</u> - content and activities that support schools in teaching digital citizenship	Ongoing	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Digital Leadership Series</u> - PD for leaders at all levels focused on being an innovative leader for today's learner	Ongoing	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)
<u>Flex Pilot Program</u> - supports schools exploring innovative approaches to school schedules by leveraging eLearning options	Spring Application	N/A

<u>Indiana Tech Plan Survey</u> - collects and shares school technology data to analyze trends and promote collaboration	March Submission	N/A
<u>Connectivity Grants</u> - defrays the cost of internet connection for LEAs	Annual	SCHOOL AND LIBRARY INTERNET CONNECTION (IC 4-34-3-2)
<u>eLearning Coach Community</u> - organized collaboration among professionals who work to support thoughtful technology integration	Ongoing	David C. Ford Fund (IC 20-20-13)

During the 2017 legislative session, the Indiana General Assembly passed HEA 1007, which allows the IDOE to authorize K-12 course providers to deliver coursework through online technologies.

- E. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities?

☒ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

The IDOE is committed to communicating and engaging multiple stakeholders, including parents, families, and communities. The IDOE provides technical assistance resources for LEAs to communicate and engage families within and beyond the ESSA federal programs, such as parent engagement workshops and academic progress updates. The IDOE communication team provides weekly updates from Superintendent McCormick from all divisions in order to adequately inform the educators and general public. Information in a language that parents can understand, such as Spanish, is regularly provided to the field. The IDOE also routinely collaborates with numerous organizations, described in the consultation section of the plan, to effectively engage the field.

6.2 Program-Specific Requirements.

The IDOE is dedicated to providing technical assistance and professional development so that schools and LEAs may implement the following federal programs in a coordinated and systematic manner to improve student achievement. Schools receive multiple funding streams and students often qualify for more than one program. Aligned programs that support each other will have a greater impact.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies

- i. Describe the process and criteria that the SEA will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA that an LEA submits on behalf of a school, including how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school.

A Title I school is eligible to become a Title I schoolwide program when the poverty level (determined by free and reduced meal counts) is at or above 40 percent. Indiana will waive this requirement for identified comprehensive support and improvement schools, targeted support and improvement schools, or any Title I school that submits a schoolwide plan that addresses how the school will meet the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school. Schoolwide programs serve all children in a school and ensure that all staff, resources, and classes are part of the overall program. Any Title I school, particularly those identified as comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, would benefit from the emphasis on schoolwide high quality instruction, evidence-based strategies, and engagement of all families to improve the achievement of all children, including those who are the lowest-achieving.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

The IDOE oversees six Migrant Regional Centers (MRCs) that operate local and regional migrant education programs. Over 2,100 migrant children ages 0-21 received supplementary educational, supportive, and referral services in 2015-2016 through the Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP). A migrant student is any child ages 0-21 who moves across school district lines, either by themselves or with a guardian who is a qualifying migrant worker, often for the purpose of seeking qualifying seasonal or temporary agricultural work. The Migrant Education Program helps ensure that migratory children overcome educational disruption and other barriers they may face due to the migratory lifestyle.

- i. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a statewide basis, including the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and how the SEA will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State on an annual basis.

The priority focus for our State is identification and recruitment (ID&R), as the IMEP aims to identify and serve 100 percent of Indiana’s migrant students each year. MRCs employ full-time, year-round recruiters throughout Indiana to strive to meet this goal, and also ensure that recruiters possess all the necessary tools and supports needed to facilitate successful ID&R. Recruiters receive regular ID&R training and guidance through eligibility review during monthly calls and at least two (2) in-person trainings per year, as well as field training and support as needed. This intense focus on ID&R ensures that our migrant students have access to the supplemental migrant services to which they are entitled.

The ID&R recruiters operate on a regional basis to be able to recruit within and across the LEAs by utilizing referrals or the work survey. This process supports the identification of enrolled K-12 eligible migratory children. Recruiters frequently visit area businesses, support or service agencies, and local farms while utilizing other resources such as the National Migrant Hotline to improve identification of all migrant children, including those who are birth through age two, ages 3-5, K-12, and out of school youth. The recruiters use Department of Labor statistics to identify farms requesting temporary seasonal workers. The MSIX database is also a recruitment tool to identify potentially eligible migrant children who are moving to Indiana so they can be interviewed soon after arrival.

Initial interviews and completion of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is initiated by the first recruiter, verified for accuracy by a second recruiter, and then signed off by a State-level recruiter or IDOE migrant specialist. The IDOE conducts a sampling of annual re-interviews and once every three years utilizes an external contractor to ensure accuracy and verify program eligibility.

- ii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.

Indiana’s Migrant Regional Centers (MRCs) administer a needs assessment to every migrant family upon enrollment into the Migrant Education Program to determine students’ academic needs, as well as health, emotional, and other needs that must be met in order for them to participate effectively in school. The needs assessments take into account the needs of the family as a whole, as well as each individual child, including preschool, school-aged, and Out of School (OSY) students.

All MRCs use MSIX to determine appropriate course placement for students in conjunction with the needs assessment. They also use all available data to constantly assess students’ educational needs. As a “receiving state,” the vast majority of Indiana’s migrant students are only present during the summer. For students that remain in the State during the regular school year, MRCs work with LEAs to monitor students’ academic progress and to determine the most appropriate supplemental services and support to provide each student.

Secondary students’ records are assessed to determine progress on graduation, and students are offered supplemental support and opportunities to take courses they are lacking or wish to take in advance of required timelines. Secondary and OSY students also receive an additional “Individual Migrant Plan” which evaluates their needs, sets attainable goals for their time in Indiana, and lays out a plan for services to address these individual needs and goals. These individual plans are tailored for students who have dropped out of, or never had access to, the

school system; with goals that may include attaining a high school diploma or equivalency, gaining technical skills and training, and increasing English language proficiency.

Preschool-aged migrant students are assessed using the SEA-determined school readiness assessment, which helps MRCs tailor support to each individual student. IDOE and MRCs work in collaboration with Migrant Head Start programs to ensure access to high-quality early childhood education for all preschool-aged migrant students in Indiana during the summer months. Where Migrant Head Start is not available, MRCs work to provide alternative access to high-quality preschool programs. MRCs also provide families with preschool-aged children age-appropriate educational materials, supplies, and training to help support and further school readiness for migrant students.

The SEA provides technical assistance, professional development, and monitoring of the MRCs to ensure that the appropriate policies and procedures are in place to ensure the unique educational needs of migrant students are identified and met.

- iii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs.

In coordination with other local, State, and federal programs, the Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) ensures that all migrant students have access to free meals and textbooks. Similarly, migrant students, PK-12, are automatically eligible for Title I funding, and IMEP works in conjunction with SEA Title I staff to guarantee students access to the core curriculum and Title I program-- ensuring that Title I, Part C funds are supplemental. Many migrant students in Indiana are also English learners. As such, the IDOE, through the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, trains LEA and SEA staff regarding the implementation of other services, such as English language development, to ensure the unique language needs of EL migrant students and associated federal requirements are being met. The limited English proficient status of a migrant child is tracked within Indiana's migrant database to inform educators about the child's eligibility for other programming and to ensure that the migrant programming meets the needs of the student.

As a condition of receiving their subgrant, MRCs are required to consult with all LEAs in their region. During this consultation the districts are informed of which services migrant students are entitled, and of the supplementary nature of Title I, Part C services. This helps to ensure that migrant students' needs are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and federal educational programs, and that they are not deprived of any other local, State or federal services to which they are entitled.

- iv. Describe how the State and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year (*i.e.*, through use of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), among other vehicles).

In order to satisfy the statutory requirements that ensure a high degree of interstate collaboration and coordination, the Indiana Migrant Education Program participates in the Interstate Migrant Education Council (IMEC) quarterly meetings, the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME), the annual ESCORT Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Forum, Pre-K Consortium Incentive Grant, and participates in the Office of Migrant Education annual director's meeting in Washington, D.C. Each of these opportunities allows IMEP staff to collaborate and network with fellow state migrant staff while coordinating efforts to best serve the needs of migrant students shared between our states.

In addition, the IMEP collaborates with the Texas Migrant Interstate Program (TMIP,) as Texas is the sending state for the majority of our students. Representatives from TMIP participate in Indiana's regional director meetings, as needed, to ensure a high level of communication and coordination between both states. This agreement also permits IMEP staff the ability to administer Texas' state content assessments for Texas migrant students who are in Indiana.

In order to ensure a timely transfer of student data, the IMEP complies with all MSIX requirements to ensure a smooth transfer of student data to states with shared migrant student populations. Migrant Regional Centers and recruiters frequently work in collaboration with bordering states to ensure that students who may move between Indiana, Michigan, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio do not experience an interruption due to a move.

The regional model of the IMEP allows for a high level of intrastate collaboration between regions, as well as with community partners in Indiana. IMEP conducts or facilitates monthly MRC Director meetings, monthly (bi-weekly in summer) recruiter meetings, annual statewide STEM summit, annual statewide summer preparation and planning meeting, summer wrap-up meeting, and regular OSY planning committee meetings. The high frequency of communication and collaboration between all migrant staff in Indiana facilitates intra-state and inter-region communication. Indiana's Migrant Information and Data Access System (MIDAS) contains information on all migrant students in Indiana. All MRCs have access to this data system, and can see what services, classes, and assessments students received in other regions.

In addition, IMEP and the MRCs are tasked with maintaining working relationships with community partners in Indiana. Such partnerships include the Indiana Migrant/Seasonal Farm Worker Coalition, TMC, institutions of higher education, and various local and regional community organizations.


- v. Describe the unique educational needs of the State's migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the State's most recent comprehensive needs assessment.

When no other local, State, or federal educational programs or funds are available, MRCs provide students with appropriate services through Title I, Part C to address their needs as identified through the family needs assessment, Individual Migrant Plans, and school readiness assessments.

In addition, parent feedback and evaluations are sought out to measure the effectiveness of the IMEP in meeting the needs of all migrant students in the State and to provide additional insight into the existing needs of the migrant community and how to best ensure their effective participation in school.

MRCs are also responsible for aligning services to Indiana's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Service Delivery Plan (SDP), which were developed in June 2015 and due to be updated by June 2018. These documents are revised every three years by a committee of MEP stakeholders that includes-- but is not limited to-- parents, MRC directors, MEP recruiters, teachers, IDOE staff, and community partners. Indiana's CNA informs program staff which areas are of the highest concern in the IMEP, and the SDP serves as a guide to MRCs when planning migrant programming.

The CNA identified the following unique needs for the State's migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school: reading and mathematics, school readiness, graduation and services for secondary-aged youth and future ready learning environments. The specific goals listed within section VI state the unique needs for each group of migratory children.



- vi. Describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, Part C, and the strategies the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes consistent with section 1304(b)(1)(D) of the ESEA.

Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs)-- created as part of the SDP-- are revisited regularly by IMEP and stakeholder groups, and are used to evaluate all migrant programs across Indiana. The most recent MPOs, which are current at the time of the submission of this plan, are outlined below:

GOAL AREA: Reading and Mathematics

- By the end of the 2015-2016 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of migrant students in grades K-12 receiving instructional services in reading for 30 days during the regular school year will maintain their Lexile level.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of migrant students participating for three weeks in a summer program will maintain their Lexile level.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of migrant students in grades K-12 receiving instructional services in math for 30 days

during the regular school year or three weeks during a summer program will make target gains on an IMEP-approved assessment.

- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of migrant students whose needs are assessed through an IMEP needs assessment will receive support services aligned to their needs.

Statewide SDP strategies for Reading and Mathematics that are aligned to the CNA:

English/Language Arts & Math Achievement (K-8):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1-1 Provide effective, evidence-based supplemental services in ELA and Math
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1-2 Ensure that sufficient support services are available to facilitate the participation of all migrant students, especially PFS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1-3 Ensure that migrant students receive accommodations and remediation as per IEPs, ILPs, and/or other general education intervention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1-4 Provide parent activities (two for a regular year program or one in a summer program) in the school and/or in the home, including information about the US & Indiana education system, opportunities for involvement, reading materials, and/or language strategies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1-5 Improve instruction in ELA and Math by training migrant staff to use evidence-based strategies with migrant students

GOAL AREA: School Readiness

- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of migrant children enrolled in a MEP-funded regular school year or summer program for ten days in a site-based program or five sessions with a home-based tutor will make progress on three skills or demonstrate proficiency in school readiness as determined by the IMEP Kindergarten School Readiness Checklist.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 90 percent of migrant preschool students will receive site or home-based support services.

Statewide SDP strategies for School Readiness that are aligned to the CNA:

School Readiness (Preschool):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2-1 Ensure migrant children who have an identified issue on a health screening (including immunizations, hearing , vision, etc.) are referred for appropriate services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2-2 Inform migrant parents of children four and older about availability of early childhood education services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2-3 Collaborate with community and state agencies and organizations to provide Early Childhood Education (ECE), special education, and comprehensive services such as health, mental health, oral health, family support, nutrition, etc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2-4 Ensure staff that work with migrant children and families receive high quality professional development regarding the unique needs of preschool migrant students and strategies that are effective to meet those needs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2-5 Provide parent education and materials (e.g., books) that address the use of home language, dialogic reading strategies, other early literacy strategies, parenting skills, parent's role in supporting child's learning in formal education settings, enhancing parent-child communication, and/or other needs identified by parents

GOAL AREA: Graduation and Services for Secondary-Aged Youth

- By the end of the 2015-2016 reporting period and each year thereafter, 65 percent of migrant students enrolled in a supplemental credit accrual program will earn at least one credit toward graduation.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 reporting period and each year thereafter, 80 percent of migrant students enrolled in supplemental instructional services will make progress toward learning goals set in their Individual Migrant Education Plan, which may include academic skills, life skills, college and career

readiness, alternative programming, or other activities as befitting the needs of secondary students or OSY.

Statewide SDP strategies for Graduation and Services for Secondary-Aged Youth that are aligned to the CNA:

Secondary/OSY Achievement and High School Graduation (9-12 and OSY):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-1 Provide opportunities for credit accrual through evening classes, flexible scheduling, online classes, and alternative programs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-2 Provide and help OSY access training and instruction designed to meet their needs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-3 Utilize available records transfer systems to ensure students are placed appropriately and are able to transfer credits and accrue credits for graduation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-4 Provide or coordinate with community agencies to assist migrant students in accessing needed support
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-5 Conduct PD about strategies for success for migrant students and youth including but not limited to evidence-based strategies for credit accrual and college and career readiness; class scheduling for migrant students to assist in attaining necessary course credits and instruction time, or strategies found to be successful with ELs in the content areas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-6 Encourage parent participation in PACs, parent workshops, and parent academies through flexible scheduling and ensuring that parents are given the opportunity to provide input
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3-7 Ensure that appropriate technology supports/tools are available to meet the unique education and language needs of migrant students

GOAL AREA: Future Ready Learning Environments

- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 80 percent of staff will use appropriate technology integration strategies as demonstrated on the Fidelity of Services Provision Rubric.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 80 percent of K-12 migrant students participating in device-assisted interstate coordination will receive supplemental instructional services aligned to their academic needs during the regular school year.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of K-12 migrant students participating in ISTE standards-aligned instruction will demonstrate a 5 percent gain on the digital literacy assessment.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of secondary migrant students participating in mentorship and leadership training will successfully complete the training.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, MEP staff will contact 90 percent of parents of migrant children to connect parents with appropriate information, tools, strategies or activities to help parents be involved in their child's education as recorded on the parent contact log.
- By the end of the 2015-2016 program year and each year thereafter, 80 percent of MEP staff participating in IMEP-approved professional development will demonstrate fidelity to strategies on the Fidelity of Services Provision Rubric.

Statewide SDP strategies for Future Ready Learning Environments that are aligned to the CAN:

Future Ready Learning Environments

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-1 Facilitate access to services that meet student needs through innovative technologies.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-2 Coordinate instructional services with the schools students attend during the regular year to provide continuity of instruction.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-3 Provide a structured digital learning environment aligned to the ISTE standards with the appropriate technology tools to migrant students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-4 Provide equitable Access to support services such as content specific programs, internet access (when applicable), and assessment programs that will enhance the educational process.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-5 Ensure that appropriate technology supports/tools are available to meet the unique education and language needs of migrant students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-6 Provide and Mandate relevant professional development appropriate to a staff member's role in regards to instructional strategies, technology curriculum, and cultural background.

- vii. Describe how the SEA will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the State and local level, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration, consistent with section 1304(c)(3) of the ESEA.

The Indiana Migrant Education Program engages parents of migratory children through local and State Parent Advisory Councils (PACs). As part of the application process for Title I, Part C, subgrants, the Migrant Regional Centers must assure that they will consult with their local PACs in the planning and operation of programs for each school year. They must also assure that all programs will be carried out in a format and language understandable to the migrant parents and in a manner that facilitates parental involvement. The IMEP has provided guidance for the MRCs to ensure commonality in PAC structure and equitable parent involvement across the regions. Requirements include the following:

- A minimum of two local PAC meetings must be held per region, per year;
- Must use basic parliamentary procedures, such as Robert's Rules of Order;
- Agenda must include a time for MEP updates and plans for instruction of migrant students, with time for parent feedback on these plans;
- Parents must be able to contribute discussion items for the meeting agenda;
- Meetings must be held at a time/place, and in a language that is accessible to migrant parents; and
- Parents selected for the local PAC must be representative of the migrant population within each region, and to the extent feasible, all groups of students must be represented.

The State PAC includes at least one parent representative from each region and meets the same requirements above for local PAC meetings. For both local and State PAC meetings, parents are offered reimbursement for travel expenses and lost wages to maximize participation.

- viii. Describe the SEA's priorities for use of Title I, Part C funds, specifically related to the needs of migratory children with "priority for services" under section 1304(d) of the ESEA, including:

1. The measures and sources of data the SEA, and if applicable, its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use to identify those migratory children who are a priority for services; and
2. When and how the SEA will communicate those determinations to all local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, in the State.

The IDOE prioritizes the use of Title I, Part C funds to first serve students who are identified as Priority for Services (PFS), as defined in ESEA 1304(d). The areas of critical need for IMEP were identified during the CNA, and placed into "Goal Areas" as part of the MPOs in Indiana's SDP described above. The IDOE also allocates additional funding to provide direct services to students most in need of targeted assistance, as identified through the SDP. Each MRC completes a priority for services form, which the IDOE provides, to identify whether a child is eligible for PFS status. The MRC then marks PFS children within Indiana's migrant database so that the MRC and the LEAs are aware of the PFS status. Indiana utilizes

two sets of criteria to identify the PFS of a child.

Criterion 1 (at least one):

- Qualifying Arrival Date interruption during the previous 12 months
- Withdrawal date during the previous 12 months
- Moved from district to district during previous 12 months
- Absent for two or more weeks during regular school year
- Withdrew and returned to school during regular school year

Criterion 2 (at least one):

- Classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) as determined by the WIDA Screener or Annual Assessment
- Student did not pass ISTEP or ECA language arts or math from the previous school year
- Student was retained from previous school year
- Student's grade placement is not age appropriate
- Student failed at least one section of a state assessment in another state
- Student is behind on accruing credits toward graduation requirements
- Student has current Individual Education Plan (IEP)
- Student is below grade level on a locally administered assessment (e.g., DIBELS, preschool screener, Acuity etc.)
- Student has grades indicating below average performance in math, language arts, sciences, or social studies
- Other reason indicating that a student is at risk for failing to meet academic content standards (must be approved by IDOE)

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

The Title I Part D Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides a formula grant to the IDOE for supplementary education services to help provide educational continuity for children and youth in State and local institutions so that these youths can make successful transitions to school or employment once they are released. Institutions for delinquent children provide services at a public or private residential or day facility for youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Institutions for neglected children provide services at a public or private residential or day facilities for youth who have been committed or voluntarily placed due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.

In the school year 2015-2016, Indiana had 1,079 children under 21 years enrolled through the Indiana Department of Corrections, which has four State-operated facilities for neglected or delinquent children. Furthermore, 36 local educational agencies partnered with local institutions to serve 1,369 neglected youths and 5,946 delinquent youths. A total of 7,315 Indiana children and youth were served through the Title I Part D Neglected and Delinquent program in 2015-2016. A total of 97 students at local institutions are limited English proficient and 1,828 students with disabilities are enrolled at State and local institutions.

- i. Describe the SEA's plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

In order for an LEA to receive Part D funds, a copy of the formal agreement between the LEA and the correctional facility or alternative school program must be uploaded to the application. The agreement delineates the two-way support between the facility and the LEA so that neglected and delinquent children and youth receive appropriate supplemental education, counseling, program services, and effective transfer of

student information. The IDOE provides technical assistance, including through the National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth, to improve transitions. In the design of the Part D program, the applicant must describe the transitional activities, including GED testing, counseling, placement programs for post-secondary institutions, assistance with financial aid, and job placement.

Additionally, neglected or delinquent children are categorically eligible for participation in the Title I, Part A program and these funds are available to coordinate such services under the Title I, Part D program.

- ii. Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program, including the knowledge and skills needed to earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment.

The IDOE has three goals in the administration of the Title I, Part D program:

1. Improve educational services in local or State institutions for neglected and delinquent children and youth in order to provide equal access and opportunity to meet the challenging Indiana Academic Standards;
2. Improve youth transition from institutionalization to further school or employment; and
3. Prevent at-risk youth from dropping out, and provide youth returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected and delinquent children and youth with a reentry support system to ensure their continued education and involvement of their families and communities.

LEAs applying for Title I, Part D funding are required to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to assess the needs of the students, determine program characteristics, and identify duration of services. This includes addressing and providing additional needs related to students with disabilities and English learners.

Through the IDOE's data reporting system, academic and vocational outcomes are tracked to ensure effective program administration and an emphasis on continuous improvement.

The IDOE expects annual increases in the following outcomes delineated below.

1. Number of students who enrolled in their local district 90 days after exiting the correctional facility
2. Number of students who earned a GED in the facility or 90 days after exit
3. Number of students who obtained a high school diploma in the facility or 90 days after exit
4. Number of students accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education in the facility or 90 days after exit
5. Number of students enrolled in job training courses/programs in the facility or 90 days after exit
6. Number of students that obtained employment
7. Number of long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams
8. Number of long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test

The IDOE expects annual decreases in the following outcomes delineated below.

1. Number of long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams

2. Number of long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams

LEAs and local facilities are provided access to the National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth. This center provides comprehensive guidance and support to LEAs and the IDOE in the administration of the Title I, Part D program.

The IDOE conducts regular onsite and desktop monitoring and technical assistance and utilizes those results to provide further technical assistance and evaluate the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program. The monitoring and technical assistance ensures timely consultation and delivery of services among appropriate facilities, LEAs, local support agencies, post-secondary institutions, and businesses.

Title I, Part D programs address the knowledge and skills needed to successfully earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment through programs focused on health and social services (e.g. day care, drug and/or alcohol abuse counseling and mental health services), vocational training, career counseling, curriculum-based entrepreneurship, mentoring, and peer mediation.

D. Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

More than 112,000 Indiana students speak a language other than English at home, and there are over 275 different languages represented in Indiana schools. Of these, over 50,000 students have been formally identified as English learners due to limited proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing academic English.

English learners make up roughly 5 percent of Indiana's total student population, and they are enrolled in schools and districts in every corner of the state. Some of these students are immigrants and refugees, but the vast majority of Indiana's English learners were born in the United States. Over 70 percent of Indiana ELs are at an intermediate or advanced level of English proficiency. These students may communicate very effectively in English in social contexts, but need direct English language instruction to acquire the academic language essential for success in Indiana schools. English learners have rich potential, and Indiana assessment data shows that students who achieve fluency in English often end up outperforming their native-speaking peers on State content assessments. Their cultural and linguistic contributions cannot be overstated, and the IDOE is committed to providing the support they need to achieve the same rigorous, college- and career-ready standards as their native English speaking peers.

i. Describe the SEA's standardized entrance and exit procedures for English learners consistent with section 3113(b)(2) of the ESEA. These procedures must include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the State. At a minimum, the standardized exit criteria must:

- i. Include a score of proficient on the State's annual English language proficiency assessment;
- ii. Be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes; and

3. Not include performance on an academic content assessment.

Indiana has established standardized statewide entrance procedures to identify and screen potential English learners based upon the accurate and timely administration of the Home Language Survey and the English language proficiency placement exam. Indiana's Home Language Survey is standardized across all LEAs and the questions are consistent with those approved by the Office of Civil Rights and Department of Justice. The Indiana Home Language Survey is administered upon a student's initial enrollment in Indiana schools. Any student with a language other than English listed on the Home Language Survey is screened for English proficiency with the state-approved English language proficiency screener. A student who does not achieve a

proficient score upon initial screening is formally identified as an English learner.

All identified English learners must participate in Indiana's annual English language proficiency exam, WIDA ACCESS for ELLs. English learners with significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed for English language proficiency with the WIDA Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment. Students who achieve a score of proficient, as defined by the State through longitudinal data analysis and consultation with WIDA, on the annual English language proficiency assessment exit the English learner program and enter the formal monitoring period required by ESSA.

LEAs are required to implement a rigorous, locally-designed monitoring process for their reclassified students which incorporates periodic input from English learner and content-area staff. Reclassified students, or former English learners, are eligible to receive support services from the LEA English language development program to address any remaining language needs. If a persistent language need is identified during the monitoring period, the IDOE has provided LEAs with a process for addressing and documenting student needs and progress and for formally reentering a student into English learner programming when appropriate.


The IDOE has a formal Home Language Survey Amendment Request process to address students who were misidentified as speaking a language other than English. School districts must submit an amendment request form with parent and district administrator sign-off, including reason for the misidentification, student English language proficiency assessment data if applicable, and original Home Language Survey for review. The IDOE English learner team reviews the Home Language Survey Amendment Request to determine whether the student was misidentified as a language minority student and approves or denies the request.

These entrance and exit procedures are required to be applied uniformly across all LEAs and are considered valid and reliable through consultation with the WIDA consortium. The entrance and exit procedures are consistent with all federal reporting and accountability requirements, including Title I. The Indiana academic content assessments are not used to determine English learner status. The standardized entrance and exit procedures are used to determine whether a student is considered an English learner and therefore entitled to an English language development program required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA). Indiana monitors the English language development program through an annual submission of each LEA's English learner plan that states its service delivery plan, consolidated federal program onsite and desktop review, and annual data collections for English learners. The English learner plan also requires that LEAs assure that all potential English learners be screened for English language proficiency within 30 days of enrollment (or within two weeks of enrollment if the student enrolls after the beginning of the school year). The implementation of the standardized entrance and exit procedures are monitored through consolidated federal program onsite and desktop review and through annual data collections for English learners.

2. SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6)): Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

- i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and
- ii. The challenging State academic standards.

All counties in Indiana have English learners and that number has grown substantially over the past decade. Differentiated support provided by the SEA is needed in order for systems with various incidence levels, experience, and knowledge to receive the support they need to meet the English learners' needs.



The IDOE conducts annual data analysis of statewide performance on WIDA ACCESS, the State-approved English language proficiency assessment. The data analysis process helps identify statewide and localized areas of need in order to shape the annual State Plan for professional development and technical assistance. The IDOE meets regularly with a stakeholder group of EL leaders from across Indiana throughout the school year. Additional LEA needs are identified and addressed in these meetings through collaborative planning.

Indiana's state-designed long-term goal is for 63.0 percent of English learners to attain English language proficiency within six (6) years. The alignment of this goal with the English Language Proficiency Domain of the state accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows the SEA and local schools to monitor this student group annually within the six-year timeline of the state long-term goal. The SEA will support LEAs in achieving the State-designed goal by annually identifying schools with fewer than 63.0 percent of English learners attaining proficiency within six years. The IDOE will provide professional development opportunities and targeted individualized technical assistance for those schools with an average timeline of growth to proficiency exceeding six years.

The IDOE provides a variety of resources, training opportunities, and published guidance to support families, teachers, building and district leaders, local school boards, and communities as they strive to meet the unique academic and social emotional needs of English learners and their families. Each year, the IDOE conducts a full-day intensive training for new Title III and EL program directors. This in-person workshop is offered to all public and nonpublic schools at no cost, and includes everything from legal requirements for serving EL students to technical assistance in completing the actual State Title III grant application. Additionally, the IDOE facilitates an annual meeting for all new and returning EL and Title III directors. This full-day meeting is also offered at no cost to all public and nonpublic school leaders and focuses on current EL issues at the federal and State levels. As part of this annual meeting, training is provided regarding implementation of federal policies, assessing English learners, and meeting the needs of dually identified English learners (e.g.,

EL students with disabilities, High Ability English learners). Additionally, this annual meeting serves as a kick-off for the IDOE EL Leadership stakeholder group, which meets in person and virtually throughout the year. Through these meetings, the needs of Indiana EL students and the schools who serve them are identified, and stakeholders and IDOE staff partner to address them.

The IDOE has created an Indiana EL Guidebook to address key issues which EL students, families, and schools face and provide guidance regarding State and federal policy. The EL team has partnered with several other divisions at the IDOE to release joint guidance for special areas relating to English learners, such as assessment, accountability, and special education evaluation and support. The IDOE also facilitates professional development opportunities regarding WIDA implementation, differentiated instruction for English learners, working with EL newcomers, and other locally-identified areas of concern for schools and districts across Indiana.

The IDOE emphasizes the importance of ongoing, high-quality cultural responsiveness training for all staff to maximize the effectiveness of English learner programming, to mediate cultural differences between schools and families, and to engage families of English learners as partners in the education process. Additionally, the IDOE supports LEAs as they seek to create partnerships with other community organizations to provide holistic wrap-around supports for English learners and their families.

Indiana has adopted the WIDA English Language Development Standards as the State college and career ready English language development standards for English learners. The WIDA ELD Standards work in conjunction with the Indiana college- and career-ready academic standards to ensure that English learners are provided with the supports they need to access grade and age-appropriate content standards, regardless of their level of English proficiency. All teachers who work with English learners, including content-area staff and EL staff, are held accountable to the implementation of the WIDA ELD Standards. The IDOE has hosted dozens of WIDA-focused professional development opportunities for Indiana schools since the adoption of the WIDA ELD Standards in the 2014-2015 school year.

3. Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8)): Describe:

- iii. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and
- iv. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

The IDOE Division of Title Grants and Support conducts consolidated onsite and desktop fiscal and programmatic monitoring of all federal grant programs, including Title III, based on a multi-faceted risk assessment process. The IDOE English learner team also conducts Title III-specific onsite and desktop monitoring of additional LEAs identified through the Title III risk assessment process. The Indiana Title III application for subgrantees requires LEAs to assure that they will comply with all federal requirements for English learner identification, assessment, and instruction. As part of the Title III application process, LEAs are also required to submit their Lau plan for core English language development for English learners at all grade and proficiency levels and to demonstrate how Title III funding will supplement, not supplant, the core EL program paid from State and local funds. LEAs also identify their goals for students at each proficiency level, as well as their number of Long-Term English learners and how Title III programming will provide additional assistance for these students to promote their growth toward proficiency.

As additional accountability for English learner growth is incorporated under Title I, and the IDOE will provide holistic support to LEAs who are identified for comprehensive and targeted support and

addressing English learner needs and performance as part of the larger school improvement framework. The IDOE English learner team provides ongoing professional development to promote high-quality instruction of English learners and technical assistance to LEAs throughout the year. The IDOE facilitates virtual and in-person meetings of a stakeholder group of district EL leaders and conducts annual directors' meetings for all new and returning LEA Title III directors. Additionally, the IDOE English learner team travels to schools and districts throughout Indiana to provide training for classroom and EL staff and to assist LEAs in strategic planning for their English learner programs.

A need identified through our stakeholder input process was support in evaluating the effectiveness of English learner programs. The IDOE will work collaboratively with LEAs to provide training and resources for outcome-focused EL program evaluation, and will work with LEAs to remediate weaknesses identified through the evaluation process through intensive professional development at the State and/or local levels, partnerships with institutions of higher education, improvement of qualified English learner staff, and application of comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans to address English learner needs.

E. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants will be a new funding option for Indiana LEAs in the 2017-2018 school year. These funds will be allocated with the intended use of increasing the capacity of LEAs, schools, and local communities to provide all students, with an emphasis on students and schools with greatest need, with access to high-quality Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), reading, career and technical education (CTE), International Baccalaureate (IB), dual credit, advanced placement (AP), or whole-child health.

1. Use of Funds (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

In accordance with section 4104 (a), 95 percent of the state allocation of funds will be awarded through a competitive grant process to public LEAs and charter schools. Indiana will reserve no more than 1 percent for state-level administrative costs. The remaining portion of funds not allocated according to 4104(a) will be utilized for monitoring of subgrantee activities, training and technical assistance to subgrantees, and capacity building in the priority areas of: reading; STEM; dual credit; technology integration; and whole-child health. Public feedback regarding ESSA implementation called for the inclusion of whole-child health, such as social-emotional supports, as a priority point in order to help all students achieve success and improve school conditions for learning.

2. Awarding Subgrants (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B)): Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

The distribution of Title IV, Part A funds will be through a competitive grant process. All competitive grant applications are rated against standard review criteria. The SEA develops and employs a Scoring Rubric aligned to the various required sections of Indiana's RFP/application, each with a prescribed point designation (with higher scores representing exemplary ratings and lower scores representing weaker ratings within scored categories). No LEA award will total less than \$10,000. LEAs receiving a subgrant may not reserve more than two percent of the total award amount for direct administrative costs. Due to the competitive nature of the grant, the State will ensure that at least 20 percent of the funds available are distributed for well-rounded educational opportunities, at least 20 percent for safe and healthy students, and a portion for effective use of technology. Indiana may allow a successful subgrantee to focus upon solely one, two, or all of these areas as long as the total State distribution appropriately matches the requirements. Competitive grants will be made available for the length of one year. LEAs may choose to carry out the activities described under this

part via a consortium or through a single application so that LEAs of varying student enrollment, demographics, and location may participate.

The Scoring Rubric, aligned to RFP/application requirements, delineates expectations that are to be evidenced by the reviewer and/or IDOE staff to justify points awarded within each section. Required elements of the RFP/application, scored by peer reviewers and thereby rated within the Scoring Rubric, include, but are not limited to, the following requirements outlined in section 4106:

- Assurance that the LEA will prioritize funding to:
 - Schools with the greatest needs, as determined by the LEA; and
 - Schools with the highest percentages or numbers of students counted in accordance with section 1124(c);
- Assurance that the LEA will complete all activities and requirements by the State, including an emphasis on the following through a needs assessment to ensure access to a well-rounded education, improvement of school conditions for student learning to create a healthy and safe school environment, or access to personalized learning through technology:
 - Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM); or
 - Reading; or
 - Career & Technical Education; or
 - International Baccalaureate (IB), Dual Credit, and Advanced Placement; or
 - Whole-child Health (e.g. Social/Emotional supports)
- Assurance that the LEA ensures equitable participation by private school children and teachers;
- Assurance that the LEA that is awarded a grant and chooses to solely focus upon technology integration shall only spend up to 25 percent of its funding on technology infrastructure;
- Assurance that the LEA consulted with, and will continue to consult with parents, teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional personnel, students, community-based organizations, local government representatives, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, charter school teachers, other school leaders, and others with relevant and demonstrated expertise, in planning for this grant;
- Descriptions of activities and programming that the LEA or consortium will carry out, such as:
 - Partnerships with institutions of higher education, business, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, or other public or private entities with a demonstrated record of success in implementing activities specific to Title IV, Part A;
 - The program objectives and intended outcomes for Title IV, Part A activities; and
 - The manner in which the LEA will periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the program in meeting the stated objectives.

Scoring Process

The purposes of the review and scoring process are to ascertain: (a) the overall strength of the applicant's proposal; (b) the applicant's potential for effectively implementing proposed activities and fiscal responsibilities; (c) the applicant's capacity to fully implement its proposed program; and (d) the likelihood that proposed strategies and activities will help participating students meet challenging Indiana Academic Standards and any local academic standards. Using the Scoring Rubric developed by the SEA, each RFP/application is independently reviewed and scored by multiple peer reviewers and/or IDOE staff.

Reviewers' individual applicant ratings are submitted to SEA staff where they are assigned a final score based on the average of each applicant's peer reviewers' ratings. In instances where the SEA determines that there are substantial differences among reviewer ratings of a single applicant, the SEA assigns an additional internal review of the RFP/application to establish a final rating.

Ranking Applicants to Determine Award Winners

Once the peer review process ends, the SEA staff begins the final review process to determine actual award

winners. Using the final score of each RFP/application (i.e., the assigned reviewers' averaged scores), the SEA ranks all applicants from highest to lowest. Then, based upon funding available, the SEA determines how many applicants can potentially be funded (in rank order). Once applications are ranked, several factors are considered in making final grantee selection determinations:

- In instances where multiple applicants fall within the cut-off score eligible for funding but cannot all be served (due to funding limitations), the SEA determines which applicants are awarded funds. This decision is most generally based upon ensuring, to the extent practicable, that awarded applicants represent various geographical regions of the State, including urban and rural communities. If the decision involves a prior applicant, the SEA also considers prior data (e.g., financial reports; numbers of students served; and any compliance actions that may have occurred).

Notification and Posting of Winners

All applicants are notified, in writing, as to whether or not their proposal was selected for funding. Awards are subject to availability of federal funds and Indiana entities selected for funding are subject to negotiation with the SEA, whereby final award amounts may be adjusted from levels projected within the RFP/application proposal. Grant awards are not final until approved by the SEA and an award letter/contract (through the Indiana Department of Administration's procurement process) is received from the IDOE. Those awarded funding are identified on the IDOE's Title IV website.

F. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

i. Describe how the SEA will use its Title IV, Part B, and other Federal funds to support State-level strategies that are consistent with the strategies identified in 6.1.A above.

The IDOE serves as the designated agency responsible for the administration and supervision of programs assisted through the federally-funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant award.

As specified by the ESSA statute, section 4202(c) State Use of Funds, the Indiana SEA will dedicate each fiscal year's 21st CCLC allocation to be used for the following purposes:

- Not less than 93 percent of State funds will be reserved for grant awards to eligible entities, defined under section 4201(b)(3), to implement 21st CCLC programs at the local level;
- Not more than two percent will be used for state administration to carry out its responsibilities, including establishing and implementing a rigorous peer review process to rate and rank applications for subgrants; and
- Not more than two percent will be used to conduct state activities relative to effective program implementation, e.g., monitoring, evaluation, capacity building, prescreening external organizations, professional development training and technical assistance

Subgrant Awards to Eligible Entities

Eligible entities include LEAs, community-based organizations, Indian tribe or tribal organizations, other public or private entities, or a consortium of two or more such agencies, organizations, or entities. Examples of Indiana eligible entities include, but are not limited to:

- School Districts/Charter Schools
- Schools (through an LEA or community-based organization)
- Educational Consortia
- Non-profit Agencies
- City or County Government Agencies

- Regional Education Service Centers
- Faith-based Organizations
- Institutions of Higher Education

Indiana will reserve not less than 93 percent of its State allocation, each fiscal year, for grant awards to implement 21st CCLC programs across Indiana. Through a highly-competitive Request for Proposal (RFP)/application and rigorous peer review process detailed in Part G-2, the SEA will make subgrant awards to eligible entities that prioritize services to:

(A) Students who primarily attend—

- Schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111(d) or other schools determined by the local educational agency to be in need of intervention and supports;
- Schools that enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models; and
- Families of such students.

(B) Applications submitted jointly by eligible entities with at least one Title I, Part A LEA and another eligible entity; and

(C) Applicants demonstrating, through a rigorous Peer Review process, that proposed activities are not currently accessible to students who would be served; or would expand accessibility to high-quality services that may be available in the community.

Funds Allocated to Recipient Entities

As required by ESSA statute, at least \$50,000 in any grant year must be requested by eligible applicant entities, and subgrant awards will be made for a period of not less than three years and not more than five years, per section 4203(a)(8). As specified within the SEA's RFP/application for grants, eligible entities will (1) describe how subgrant programs will be coordinated with other programs funded under ESSA, and other programs as appropriate; (2) assure that subgrant funds will be used to supplement and not supplant other federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide 21st CCLC programs and activities; and (3) describe within its sustainability plan how funded activities will continue after grant funding ends.

State Administration

The SEA will use not more than two percent of its State allocation, each fiscal year, to carry out its 21st CCLC responsibilities. Administrative funds will be dedicated to supporting:

Program-Funded Staff

A program director, assistant director, and two grant specialists are funded through SEA administrative program funds and serve as the IDOE's 21st CCLC program staff.

Assistant Director: Responsible for the daily operations and oversight of all 21st CCLC responsibilities and State activities and reports to IDOE's Director of Title Grants and Support. Together, the director and assistant director work collaboratively with IDOE's Office of Financial Services to ensure the fiscal integrity and management of both SEA resources and subgrantee allocations, including financial reporting obligations and the approval and processing of relevant budgetary changes, invoices and travel requests. The assistant director oversees the work of the IDOE grant specialists and contracted staff (e.g., PD and technical assistance) and works collaboratively

with program and department staff, as well as stakeholders to implement high-quality State activities as defined in section 4202(c)(3). In addition to in-state meetings and trainings, the assistant director also attends federal meetings to stay abreast of program expectations, network with other state coordinators, and observe best practices to share with Indiana stakeholders.

21st CCLC Grant Specialists: Work under the direction of the assistant director to support the administrative responsibilities and State activities of Indiana’s 21st CCLC program. Their responsibilities include, but are not limited to: providing day-to-day support and technical assistance to grantees; conducting subgrant monitoring activities; overseeing program improvement plans resulting from grantee monitoring findings; supporting the development of the RFP and new comprehensive 21st CCLC Handbook; supporting the work of the peer review process; supporting PD and webinar trainings; participating in staff development for capacity building; reviewing grantee application amendments and renewals for purposes of approval; and evaluation data collection and oversight of EZ Reports—used to complete the federal 21APR and prepare the annual Statewide Evaluation Report.

Peer Review Process

Administrative funds will be used to pay peer reviewers for their time and participation in the review and ranking of eligible entity RFPs (applications) for 21st CCLC funding. Peer reviewers will be identified and selected by the SEA based on reviewers’ expertise in providing effective academic, enrichment, youth development, and related services to children. The SEA will not include any applicants, or representatives of an applicant, that have submitted an RFP for the current application period. The number of peer reviewers selected by the SEA will be based upon the number of eligible entities submitting Letters of Intent to apply for grant funding. Other relevant peer review administrative costs may include the identification and vetting of potential peer reviewers, RFP scoring rubric development, peer reviewer training and the compilation of relevant applicant/awardee data.

State Activities

The SEA will use not more than five percent of its State allocation, each fiscal year, to conduct State activities relative to effective program implementation at both the State and the local levels.

Monitoring

All new subgrantees receive an on-site monitoring visit within the first 12 months of funding to ensure activities occur as approved within the grant and for SEA staff to gather information regarding future technical assistance needs.

IDOE 21st CCLC program staff annually monitors grants by reviewing and approving budget worksheets prior to each implementation phase and conducting Desk-top Reviews on select compliance and quality elements (e.g., program implementation; partnerships & collaboration; staff management; safety & nutrition; program evaluation).

As desk-top reviews are completed, IDOE program specialists rate the grantee as: Exemplary (exceeds expectations); Meeting Requirements; In Development (whereby the grantee would be asked to submit a written plan to address identified deficiencies or needs; or Non-Compliant (where grantee has not begun or is not currently engaged in efforts aimed at meeting program expectations or deliverables of their approved application.

Using these findings and other periodic benchmarks, the SEA employs a risk assessment to determine the scope of ongoing SEA onsite programmatic and fiscal monitoring and/or technical assistance needs for all funded entities throughout the entire project period. Risk assessment ratings range from “no apparent risk” to

“low,” “moderate” or “significant risk” on the following indicators:

1. Experience of the afterschool administrative staff (or changes in administrative personnel);
2. Length of time between monitoring reviews;
3. Severity of select monitoring findings and resolution of required corrective actions;
4. Severity of select fiscal responsibility findings and resolution of required corrective actions;
5. Grant award amount;
6. Number and severity of audit findings;
7. Drawdown performance; and
8. Emergent issues with potential medium-high impact on effective programming.

Overall program implementation as determined by desk-top and onsite monitoring, financial integrity and reporting, and evaluation results also inform the SEA’s decision-making for program renewal.

Providing Capacity Building, Training and Technical Assistance for SEA Staff and Eligible Entities that are Applicants or Recipients of Awards

Across a program year, the IDOE offers training and technical assistance to support both award recipients, as well as eligible applicant entities. Training examples include: regional fall “grant access & readiness tour” to build awareness and help potential applicants and new grantees understand CCLC and RFP (application) expectations; Webinars and relevant trainings to support applicants’ preparation of RFP seeking 21st CCLC grant funding; New cohort orientation training and support materials; EZ Evaluation Reports webinar trainings; Financial webinar training; and a Statewide Evaluation webinar.

As determined through consultation with the Governor’s Office, other state agencies, and a stakeholder advisory group committed to youth development programs and adult learning activities, guidelines were established to further ensure that subgrant awards are of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality and effective programs. The SEA is working to prepare an updated Indiana 21st CCLC Program Guide, broad in scope—both programmatically and fiscally—to serve as a comprehensive reference point for applicant and grantee questions. This will be an invaluable resource to both State and local program staff.

Since grantee needs vary considerably, Indiana does not mandate a “one-size fits all approach” to professional development or technical assistance. Therefore, the SEA offers various options (a menu approach) for PD training options for local 21st CCLC program staff on topics such as: STEM; Literacy; College & Career Readiness; Family Engagement; Positive Youth Development; Leadership Development; Nonprofit Management; and Grant Compliance. The SEA also supports the approval of local PD options that align directly with the training priorities of the LEA served by the program (e.g., blended-learning instructional strategies). Conferences relevant to effective afterschool learning (in-state and out-of-state) are attended by both State and local program staff (e.g., the 21st CCLC Summer Institute sponsored by USDOE; Multistate Conferences; the National Afterschool Association Convention; the Out of School Learning Summit in Indianapolis).

The IDOE 21st CCLC program staff offer ongoing technical assistance to grantees across the project period and through periodic 21st CCLC “All Grantee Meetings” hosted by the SEA. Beyond that, those entities identified by the SEA as high need/struggling grantees receive direct onsite technical assistance, delivered by external experts and aligned specifically to the individual grantee’s identified need.

Conducting a Comprehensive Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Programs and Activities

The SEA will conduct a statewide evaluation of the effectiveness of Indiana’s 21st CCLC programs and activities. Staff will collect and track local grantee evaluation data, aligned to the reporting requirements of the federal 21APR, including Grantee Overview data (contact information, grantee location, grantee type, and

grantee award information); Contact Information (center name/location, verification of expanded learning time activities, feeder school designations, partners, and types of activities including: properties of activities, student participation rates, staffing overviews, participant attendance rates, ethnicity of participants, gender, special populations, and family participation data); and Outcomes, e.g., State assessment data, teacher survey results, or participants' classroom grades. In addition to annually reporting all grantees' 21APR data to the U.S. Department of Education, the SEA will prepare an annual State Evaluation Report showing statewide data findings, as well as evidence of program and activity effectiveness and utilization of the Indiana Afterschool Standards. Results will be shared with stakeholders, posted on the SEA's 21st CCLC website, and used by the SEA to inform program decision-making.

Ensuring Grantees Comply with Section 4202(c)(3)(E(F) and (H)

The SEA understands its responsibility for ensuring grantee compliance with the following elements:

- Align activities with challenging State Academic Standards;
- Identify partners with external organizations in the community, if available; and
- Coordinate funds with other federal and State funds to implement high-quality programs.

Each of the aforementioned required elements are examined by the SEA at multiple levels. They are included within Indiana's RFP (application for grant award), generating points within the SEA's aligned Scoring Rubric used by peer reviewers to rate and rank grant applications. Each element is also embedded in the SEA's desk-top monitoring reviews of grantees and observed during onsite monitoring visits.

Providing a List of Prescreened External Organizations

Newly required under ESSA, the IDOE staff is working to complete its initial list of prescreened external organizations (e.g., networks or intermediaries) that local program entities may select to provide targeted professional development or offer technical assistance in supporting their afterschool programming efforts. Indiana's prescreened external organization representatives will be comprised of entities that are youth development experts and educators with a proven history of running or supporting afterschool initiatives, such as: the Indiana Afterschool Network; the Indiana Association of United Ways; the Indiana Youth Institute; and Indiana universities and colleges.

Those prescreened external organizations initially-identified will be posted on the SEA's 21st CCLC website prior to the next RFP, and will be updated as the SEA works with its Advisory Group and other stakeholders to ascertain other options for the identification and approval of additional external organizations.

Working with Stakeholders to Review & Improve State Policies and Practices

The SEA's 21st CCLC Advisory Group will meet periodically across each program year to inform State policy decisions relevant to grant-funded afterschool initiatives and program expectations. While two-three annual meetings will generally suffice, additional meetings may be convened, if desired or needed. The diverse Advisory Group is composed of knowledgeable individuals who are program champions, deeply committed to ensuring effective afterschool initiatives across Indiana.

ii. Describe the SEA's processes, procedures, and priorities used to award subgrants consistent with the strategies identified above in 6.1.A. above and to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations.

Based on ESSA statutory requirements, the SEA defines eligibility criteria for highly-competitive 21st CCLC grant awards and prescribes those expectations within an applicant RFP notification. Eligible applicants must submit applications that conform to the SEA's established RFP process, delineated on its website and detailed through applicant trainings conducted prior to the RFP/application submission due date.

The SEA will make 21st CCLC grant awards to eligible entities that serve students who primarily attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and

improvement activities under section 1111(d); other schools determined by the LEA to be in need of intervention and supports; and the families of such students. Applications submitted within the prescribed timeline are reviewed by SEA program staff to ensure completeness, applicant eligibility and adherence to submission requirements, before advancing to the SEA's rigorous Peer Review process for the identification potential grant recipients.

Scoring Rubric Developed for Use by Peer Reviewers

All competitive grant applications are rated against standard review criteria. The SEA develops and employs a Scoring Rubric aligned to the various required sections of Indiana's RFP/application, each with a prescribed point designation (with higher scores representing exemplary ratings and lower scores representing weaker ratings within scored categories).

The Scoring Rubric, aligned to RFP/application requirements, delineates expectations that are to be evidenced by the reviewer to justify points awarded within each section. Required elements of the RFP/application, scored by peer reviewers and thereby rated within the Scoring Rubric, include but are not limited to:

- Assurance that the program will target students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 and the families of such students;
- Description of the partnership between an LEA, a community-based organization, and another public entity or private entity, if appropriate;
- Demonstration of need for 21st CCLC program, based on an analyses of community needs (including the needs of working families) and available resources for the CCLC program, and describe how partners were involved in assessing need and services;
- Demonstration that 21st CCLC funds will be used to increase the level of State, local and other non-federal funds that would in the absence of these funds be made available for programs and activities authorized by this program (i.e., cannot supplant federal, State, local or non-federal funds);
- Description of the supplemental activities to be funded, demonstrating that students receive at least 300 additional program hours before, during, or after the traditional school day;
- Demonstration that the eligible entity will use best practices, including research or evidence-based practices, to provide educational and related activities that will complement and enhance academic performance, achievement, postsecondary and workforce preparations, and possible youth development of student participants;
- Description of how travel safely to and from the center and home (as applicable) is provided to program participants, and assurances that the program occurs in a safe and easily accessible facility;
- Description of how activities are expected to improve student academic achievement, as well as overall student success;
- Description of how the eligible entity will disseminate information about the 21st CCLC program (including its location) to the community in a manner that is understandable and accessible;
- Demonstration of how the proposed program coordinates with other federal, State and local programs and makes effective use of public resources;
- Assurance that the proposed program is developed and will be carried out in active collaboration with participating schools that students attend (including in the sharing of relevant data, in compliance with applicable laws relating to privacy and confidentiality) and with partnership entities;
- Assurance that the proposed program is developed in alignment with Indiana's Academic Standards and Indiana Afterschool Standards;
- Description of how the activities will meet the measures of effectiveness described in section 4205(b) including: established performance measures aligned to expectations of the regular school program (i.e., measures that track student success and improvement over time; include State assessment results; and other indicators, such as attendance during school day, regular classroom grades, survey data);
- Description of how the applicant will encourage and use appropriately qualified persons to serve as

volunteers, if the eligible entity plans to use volunteers in activities carried out through the 21st CCLC program;

- Description of a preliminary plan for how the community learning center will continue after 21st CCLC funding ends;
- Assurance that the community will be given notice of the applicant's intent to submit an application/RFP for 21st CCLC funds, and will make it available for public review after submission; and
- The SEA offers priority points to applications submitted jointly by a Title I, Part A local educational agency (includes Indiana charter schools) and at least one community-based or faith-based organization or other public/private entity. Priority points are also awarded if applicants meet or exceed expectations defined within its RFP guidelines.

Selection and Training of Peer Reviewers

The rigorous Peer Review process will be established in consultation with the Governor's Office and other state agencies for administering youth development programs and adult learning activities. IDOE 21st CCLC staff does not review the RFP/application sections generating scoring points to determine the ranking of proposals potentially eligible for funding. For proposal scoring, the Department solicits reviewers and collects resumes to identify a cross-section of external peer reviewers with knowledge and experience in out-of-school time educational programs, elementary and secondary education, and higher education. Every effort is made to select reviewers that represent local educational agencies (both urban and rural), community-based organizations, and faith-based organizations from different regions of the State.

The SEA's 21st CCLC staff convenes individuals selected as peer reviewers to participate in a group training session and receive their assigned RFP/applications. Peer reviewers are required to remove themselves from the review and scoring of any RFP/application for which they have a real or perceived conflict of interest. Reviewers receive an overview of 21st CCLC program expectations, a review of common terms and acronyms, and an explanation of their role in serving as a peer reviewer. As a group, reviewers are taught how to use the SEA's Scoring Rubric to determine their RFP/application ratings (and justify scores awarded in the lowest or highest range of ratings) within each scoring category. Following group training, eligible entity RFPs/applications are assigned, by the SEA, to individual peer reviewers for independent scoring. SEA staff oversees the process and remain available to address questions, as needed, and to collect scoring documents and applicant RFPs as the peer reviewers complete assigned RFP/applications.

Scoring Process

The purposes of the review and scoring process are to ascertain: (a) the overall strength of the applicant's proposal; (b) the applicant's potential for effectively implementing proposed activities and fiscal responsibilities; (c) the applicant's capacity to fully implement its proposed program; and (d) the likelihood that proposed strategies and activities will help participating students meet challenging Indiana Academic Standards and any local academic standards. Using the Scoring Rubric developed by the SEA, each RFP/application is independently reviewed and scored by multiple peer reviewers.

Reviewers' individual applicant ratings are submitted to SEA staff where they are assigned a final score based on the average of each applicant's peer reviewers' ratings. In instances where the SEA determines that there are substantial differences among reviewer ratings of a single applicant, the SEA assigns an additional internal review of the RFP/application to establish a final rating.

Ranking Applicants to Determine Award Winners

Once the peer review process ends, the SEA staff independently begins the final review process to determine actual award winners. Using the final score of each RFP/application (i.e., the assigned reviewers' averaged scores), the SEA ranks all applicants from highest to lowest. Then, based upon funding available, the SEA

determines how many applicants can potentially be funded (in rank order). Once applications are ranked, several factors are considered in making final grantee selection determinations:

- The SEA first verifies that a 21st CCLC-funded program does not already exist for a school (grade levels) during the same grant application period proposed by a new eligible entity (the new potential grant award winner).
- The SEA also verifies that there are not two (or more) separate applicants proposing to serve the same school (grade levels).
- In instances where multiple applicants fall within the cut-off score eligible for funding but cannot all be served (due to funding limitations), the SEA determines which applicants are awarded funds. This decision is most generally based upon ensuring, to the extent practicable, that awarded applicants represent various geographical regions of the State, including urban and rural communities. If the decision involves a prior applicant, the SEA also considers prior data (e.g., financial reports; numbers of students served; and any compliance actions that may have occurred).

Notification & Posting of Winners

All applicants are notified, in writing, as to whether or not their proposal was selected for funding. Awards are subject to availability of federal funds and Indiana entities selected for funding are subject to negotiation with the SEA, whereby final award amounts may be adjusted from levels projected within the RFP/application proposal. Grant awards are not final until approved by the SEA and an award letter/contract (through the Indiana Department of Administration's procurement process) is received from the IDOE. Those awarded funding are identified on the IDOE's 21st CCLC website.

G. Title V, Part B: Rural and Low-Income School Program

The purpose of the Rural and Low Income Schools grant is to provide financial assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to assist them in increasing student achievement.

i. Provide the SEA's specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program, if applicable.

Indiana's first programmatic goal states that all students will reach high standards, at a minimum proficiency or better, in English/Language Arts, and Mathematics. Of the 45 school districts that participated in the RLIS grant in the prior year, 23 showed an increase from the previous year in their English/Language Arts scores on the State's ISTEP+ assessment.

The second programmatic goal states that school dropout rates will decrease by 0.5 percent during the RLIS grant period. Additionally, five Indiana RLIS grant school districts maintained a rate of zero (0) dropouts in 2015.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) receives RLIS funds on a formula basis. The amount of funding a state receives is based on its proportionate share of children in average daily attendance (ADA) in all districts eligible to participate in the RLIS program. For the FY2015 Rural and Low Income allocation, 45 school districts in Indiana applied for and received funds. IDOE utilizes funding under this subpart to ensure LEAs target funding to allowable activities under Title I, Title II, Title III, and Title IV in order to help students meet challenging State academic standards.

In order to achieve the overarching goal of helping students meet challenging State academic standards, funding is utilized in the following ways:

- Teacher recruitment and retention;
- Professional development for educators, including training on the effective use of technology;

- Support for educational technology and technology designed to improve instruction for students with disabilities;
- Parent involvement activities;
- Title I-approved activities to improve instruction for students in poverty; and
- Improving instruction for English learners.

The Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) includes initiatives designed help rural districts that may lack the personnel and resources to compete effectively for Federal competitive grants and that often receive grant allocations in amounts that are too small to be effective in meeting their intended purposes.

The Alternative Uses of Funds Authority is a flexibility provision that allows eligible LEAs to combine funding under certain programs to carry out local activities under other specified Federal programs. Indiana LEAs that are awarded RLIS grants may use the funds to carry out one more of the following activities delineated below.

- Title I, Part A (Improving Basic Programs Operated by local education agencies)
- Title II, Part A (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants)
- Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students)
- Title IV, Part A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment)

IDOE awards annual subgrants to LEAs that meet the applicable requirements. District eligibility for the RLIS grant is specifically tied to the following criteria: 1) twenty percent or more of the children aged 5 to 17 served by the LEA must be from families with incomes below the poverty line; and 2) all schools served by the LEA must have a locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the U.S. Secretary of Education.

During the 2016-2017 school-year, 45 LEAs were awarded funds for the Rural and Low Income Program in Indiana. The IDOE maintains regular communication with LEAs (i.e. grant application deadlines, remaining funds memos, and grant revision correspondence) to ensure guidelines are met throughout the grant period. LEAs are also provided with ongoing grant implementation and technical assistance such as allowable activities guidance, REAP regulatory guidance, fiscal best practices, and updates or changes with the REAP program from U.S. Department of Education.

H. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

i. Consistent with section 722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act, describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the State and assess their needs.

The Indiana Department of Education through the Indiana Education for Homeless Children and Youth program (INEHCY),⁷³ currently employs several strategies to identify and assess the needs of homeless children and youth. These strategies include training, outreach, technical assistance and guidance, monitoring, McKinney-Vento sub-grants, and state law. These strategies are used in tandem to ensure that, regardless of where or when children become homeless, whether they are in sub-grant districts or not, they are able to access a public education.

- A. A key strategy in identification is training offered to a broad audience which includes homeless liaisons, district staff, district administrators, several State agencies, and community service providers. Training opportunities address how homelessness is defined and what it portrays across Indiana, the educational rights of homeless children and youth, the roles of the homeless liaison and state coordinator, and best practices in addressing the needs of homeless children and youth. Elementary and Secondary Education uses a variety of formats and customize trainings to current

⁷³ INEHCY website: <http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services/indiana-education-homeless-children-youth-inehcy>

topics and specific requests.

- B. The timely identification of students who qualify for services and supports, under the McKinney-Vento Act, is the paramount duty of the homeless liaison within every local education agency (LEA) in our State. To best facilitate the identification of children and youth who are experiencing homelessness, housing questionnaires are provided to the parents of each child, and each unaccompanied youth, in every district.
- C. The dissemination of the housing questionnaire is to occur at the beginning of each school year, and also upon new enrollment for students entering the district throughout the academic year. Student enrollment and the provision of supportive services are to take place immediately upon student enrollment to ensure timely attention to the needs of students who are experiencing homelessness. In addition to the use of the housing questionnaire, LEAs are to use an intake/interview form with all students who qualify as homeless according to the McKinney-Vento Act, to ensure that all district services and necessary supports are identified and provided.
- D. The McKinney-Vento Act applies to children and youth age 21 and under, consistent with their eligibility for public education services under State and federal law. State laws vary, but generally provide access to all students until high school graduation or equivalent, or until age 18 or over. For special education students, federal law provides the right to access services until age 22. 20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(1)(A) and IC § 20-35-1-8. The McKinney-Vento Act includes no program-specific age requirements to qualify as an unaccompanied homeless youth. Thus, if a youth is eligible for K-12 public education in the State, he or she may be enrolled and served as an unaccompanied homeless youth.
- E. The State Education Agency (SEA) collects homeless student data from the Local Educational Agency (LEA) through an electronic survey-Homeless Summary Report. The purpose of this data collection is to gather student specific data/information on the student experiencing homelessness, students identified as receiving 504 services and students of active duty parents in the armed forces, during the academic school year. This information is used for federal and State reporting. LEAs collect homeless student data locally through the use of housing questionnaires, and then submit the information to their district level student information systems; those data are then reported to Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY). The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data are made available to SEAs for verification and correction. Once completed, the data are reviewed by Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth staff & Data Collection staff, certified, and submitted to U.S. Department of Education through the Education Data Exchange Network/Ed-Facts system.
- F. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) offers routine, comprehensive training to all LEAs regarding the duties of the district, including the requirements related to the immediate identification and enrollment of homeless children and youth, the use of housing questionnaires and intake forms, the provision of all services and supports necessary for academic success in school, and the requirement for routine data collection and reporting.

ii. Describe the SEA's programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Act, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths.

ESSA has created a renewed focus on measuring and reporting the academic performance of some of our most vulnerable students, including those who are homeless. These new requirements will give states and districts detailed information to determine whether students are receiving the support necessary to be successful.

- A. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) offers a comprehensive program for school personnel, including liaisons, principals and other school leaders,

- attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel, to heighten the awareness of school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youth.
- B. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) offers routine, comprehensive training for LEA liaisons, and all interested school district staff are welcome and encouraged to attend. Training includes information pertaining to the federal requirements outlined in the Act to ensure local districts appropriately implement the law and immediately enroll and serve children and youth experiencing homelessness. Other State and federal programs including Migrant Education; Title I, Part A; Head Start; school nutrition; Title I, Part D; foster care; and other State and federal partners routinely provide informational support through supplemental presentations at McKinney-Vento training. Multiple onsite regional training opportunities are offered throughout the school year, with additional Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth resources such as sample forms, translated materials for families, National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE) posters, flyers, Informational tip sheets and other resources included. Live and recorded webinars from National Association for the Education of Homeless Children & Youth (NAEHCY) and National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE) are provided by Indiana's McKinney-Vento state coordinator as specific topics and issues warrant additional information for the field.
- C. With the additional language pertaining to LEA training in the newly reauthorized McKinney-Vento Act, Indiana will continue to providing robust and comprehensive training and technical assistance to LEAs, and will add a tracking component to allow IDOE McKinney-Vento program staff to focus on outreach and technical assistance for districts that do not access training opportunities as frequently as they should.
- The Indiana McKinney-Vento Academy (www.edifyk12.com) provides consistency in guidance throughout Indiana. This site was developed so that we can provide a streamlined way for communication, learning, resources and credentialing. These courses were developed to help train new and current Liaisons and to provide credentials once the courses have been completed.
 - Participants may download any resources that were uploaded directly from the Indiana McKinney-Vento Academy such as a PDF or a MS Word document. These resources are provided through the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE) and the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (NAEHCY), as well as training provided by The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY).
 - IDOE's McKinney-Vento State Coordinator will have the ability to track the progress of Liaisons as they transition through the Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced Courses with usage information and real-time assessment data. All assessments have been aligned to McKinney-Vento Standards, allowing McKinney-Vento staff to see where Liaisons might need additional support for their learning.
- D. Full-day McKinney-Vento liaison training workshops are offered by the SEA multiple times throughout the school year, in addition to breakout presentations at conferences offered by other state agencies and partner organizations. All districts are also notified monthly, through electronic alerts, regarding the availability of training and webinars offered through the NCHE.

Additionally, IDOE has a longstanding relationship with the National Center for Homeless Education, which is the official clearinghouse and technical assistance center for the U.S. Department of Education. Resources including Liaison Toolkits, issue briefs, online training, webinars and other materials are routinely sourced as Indiana Education for the Homeless Children & Youth provides a layered approach to training and technical assistance. INEHCY provides telephone and email

assistance through The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) office and is available to school district personnel upon request. The provision of training and technical assistance is a critical component of Indiana's McKinney-Vento program, as best practices are shared along with the legal requirements of the Act.

iii. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved.

The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) developed and implemented a three tiered homeless dispute resolution process to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved. Since that time, homeless parents, or unaccompanied homeless youth, who wish to appeal a school district's decision related to the identification, enrollment, placement or provision of services for homeless students may engage in the homeless dispute resolution process. All districts in the State of Indiana use the same dispute process to ensure consistency across the state in the event that students move across school district lines.

- A. Students must remain enrolled, be allowed to attend school as normal, and continue to receive all services as a homeless student would be eligible for during the time the dispute is being settled.
- B. Students may not be expelled without due process of the law.
- C. Students and their families must be provided with a written explanation of any decisions.
- D. That notice must also include information on how to appeal the decision through the Indiana State Board of Education, the contact information of the school district's McKinney-Vento Liaison, and the contact information of the state coordinator.

iv. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that that youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies.

The McKinney-Vento program at IDOE has an ongoing collaborative relationship which creates a cross-agency support system when coordinating services and supports for early learners. The McKinney-Vento Liaison Training, offered through The Indiana McKinney-Vento Academy, includes input from early childhood/preschool/Head Start/ECE (Early Childhood Education) programs, including information related to the Head Start regulations relevant to homeless children. Additionally, the competitive McKinney-Vento grants offered by The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) to LEAs include coordination and targeted services for early learners/preschoolers experiencing homelessness so that they can enroll in, attend and succeed in preschool programs. These efforts may include reserving slots, collecting data and conducting community needs assessments relevant to homeless early learners. LEAs are made aware of the federal McKinney-Vento requirements related to the priority for enrollment and the provision of services for homeless preschool students, including transportation to school of origin when in the best interest of the student. With the reauthorization of the McKinney-Vento Act, LEAs in Indiana will recognize school of origin rights for preschool students in programs operated by the LEAs.

ix. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and

Indiana has taken a multi-pronged approach to the needs of both unaccompanied homeless youth enrolled in

school and those youth who have been separated from school including youth that have had little or no education. Through the multipronged approach, the definition and identification of unaccompanied homeless youth, their needs, and best practices for supporting them are covered in the Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) program trainings (including technical assistance, subgrant funding, and monitoring, as described above). In addition, the IDOE program also reaches out other offices within the State of Indiana to integrate awareness and the needs of unaccompanied homeless youth into their work. To ensure that homeless youth who are separated from public schools are identified and 140 accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth collaboration includes the following elements.

- A. Professional development and training opportunities described above include presentation/discussion of key strategies and approaches to address the needs of youth separated from public schools. This includes strategies for ensuring the granting of appropriate credit and the removal of barriers to successful student participation in secondary education.
- B. Districts are encouraged to provide supplemental opportunities, including access to online courses, summer school, mentoring programs and tutoring through Title I-A as ways to provide the enhanced services, such as credit recovery for students experiencing homelessness.
- C. Districts are encouraged to promote participation in after-school programming, such as 21st Century Community Learning Center programs, if available, for positive youth development, increased focus on academic success and credit recovery.
- D. The state coordinator has presented and recommended homeless liaisons to speak on panels at conferences on dropout prevention and re-engagement. Trainings offered by other divisions within the department that address the re-engagement and support of out of school youth are highlighted for homeless liaisons.
 - i. Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) will continue to collaborate with other LEA's dropout prevention staff and encourage the use of Individual Learning Plans for homeless students given their high mobility. Training has been and will continue to be provided with a specific focus on re-engaging youth, using student developed Individual Learning Plans, verification of homelessness, assisting youth with FAFSA applications and college and career counseling.
 - ii. The Indiana Homeless/ Unattached Youth Verification for the Purposes of Federal Financial Aid is posted on Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) website.
 - iii. Verification of homelessness for all students, particularly unaccompanied homeless youth, is covered in the initial sessions for homeless liaisons and is discussed in technical assistance calls.

Educational stability for vulnerable students, particularly those that are homeless, is critical. Students experiencing homelessness will not be separated from their peers, and will receive the same opportunities to fully participate as any other student would enjoy. State policies and procedures, outlined on <http://www.doe.in.gov/student-services/indiana-education-homeless-children-youth-inehcy> , ensure that students are not segregated or stigmatized on the basis of their homeless status and there are no barriers to enrollment and attendance in all academic and extracurricular activities.

ix. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) ensures that homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities.

Children and youth experiencing homelessness are to be enrolled and able to fully participate in all school activities. Extracurricular and co-curricular school activities, such as sports, arts, music, theater, debate, and clubs, are often a key to engaging children and youth in school. They can provide students with a sense of belonging, stability, pride, and responsibility and strengthen a student's application for higher education admission and scholarships. The following expectations are applicable to extracurricular and co-curricular school activities, with a particular emphasis on homeless students' participation in sports.

- A. Homelessness can create barriers to participation in extracurricular activities. Homeless students who change schools during the school year may not meet residency requirements related to sports or may enter school in the middle of the season. They may lack birth certificates, physical examinations, and other documents normally required prior to participation and may not be able to pay for equipment or fees. The McKinney-Vento Act provides legal rights and support to help ensure that students experiencing homelessness can participate fully in extracurricular school activities.
- B. LEAs are required to enroll children and youth experiencing homelessness immediately. "Enroll" is defined in the McKinney-Vento Act as specifically "attending classes and participating fully in school activities." Therefore, homeless students must be allowed to enroll and participate immediately in class and other academic activities and extracurricular and co-curricular school activities, such as sports, music, art, and clubs. This includes identifying and removing barriers that prevent such children and youth from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies. This also includes ensuring that homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels. School districts are encouraged to cooperate with agencies and organizations for the homeless to explore comprehensive, equivalent alternative educational programs and support services for homeless children and youth when necessary to implement the intent of these rules.
- C. The Department's monitoring of McKinney-Vento compliance includes a review of documentation of district policies and procedures to ensure homeless students have full access to academic and extracurricular activities. This includes access to summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement and online learning. The state coordinator collaborates with local athletic programs and the Indiana High School Athletic Association to ensure that students are able to fully participate in after-school sports and activities.
- D. Athletic associations must comply with the McKinney-Vento Act's requirements, and must remove barriers to homeless students' participation in sports, paying special attention to participation rules related to attendance and residency. Moving into the 2017-2018 school year, Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY), with guidance from IDOE-legal team, will work with Indiana High School Athletic Association (IHSAA) to develop guidance and explore best practices related to full athletic participation by homeless students. Similarly, to ensure homeless students' access to all school activities, barriers due to outstanding fees and fines are to be addressed by LEAs. Fees for extracurricular activities are to be waived or paid through donations or district funds.

vi. Describe the SEA's strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.

Understandably, it can be difficult for students who are homeless to maintain regular attendance at school, which often leads to these students being chronically absent. Every effort is made by districts to ensure that prompt services are provided to overcome this barrier by providing support through: Title-I services, early learning, credit recovery, and access to other college and career readiness opportunities. The IDOE's state coordinator works with State support teams, through the regional system of support, to help address local needs through the improvement process.

Non-academic barriers are also a priority and consideration as districts determine how to best provide the stability and consistency homeless students need to be successful in school. Indiana offers a competitive process for districts to apply for additional funds to support the academic, tangible and intangible, needs of this population. The applicants are scored according to need and quality of application.

The point at which children enter a school is often the point at which they are identified as homeless. One of the strongest strategies to ensure identification at enrollment and to eliminating enrollment delays has been the training of enrollment staff. This group is often overlooked for training and professional development opportunities so when their role in working with families is spotlighted, they respond enthusiastically. The detailed knowledge of the community and each family within the school is framed as the foundation for spotting the clues to possible homelessness. These trainings offered by the state coordinator and local homeless liaison have ensured greater immediate access for incoming students and have facilitated access to support services for families and students that might otherwise have become disconnected.

The Indiana Homeless Education plan has been reviewed and revised to reflect reauthorization under ESSA and addresses the immediate enrollment of homeless students, their school records, school selection, and transportation. The Advisory is posted on the Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) webpage and is covered in the all training sessions for homeless liaisons.

Requirements of immunization and other required health records as specified below.

- A. The Indiana Department of Public Health reviews its policies on immunizations and health records annually. Notifications of these updates go out to all schools and are posted on the Children and Hoosier Immunization Registry Program (CHIRP). This collaboration with Department of Health has removed barriers during enrollment and has built awareness among school nurses who are often the front line staff identifying already enrolled homeless students.
- B. Similarly, guidance and adjustment counselors may become aware of already enrolled students' homelessness before other staff or faculty members. Training for this group focuses on the impact of homelessness on learning and behavior and equips guidance and adjustment counselors with the knowledge they need to support their students, including high school students who are approaching graduation and planning for post-secondary education.
- C. The state coordinator stresses collaboration with local medical, dental and mental health clinics that can provide immunizations and physical examinations. This collaboration has facilitated homeless students being treated for their needs and ensures access to sports and other school activities. The state coordinator has presented to school-based health clinic staff and clarifies communications between school health providers and homeless liaisons. School nurses and health providers have been grateful to know how to answer questions and to refer students and families that have self-disclosed their homelessness.
- D. As a best practice, larger districts and most mid-size districts have implemented building contacts that are able to support the district's homeless liaison in identifying and supporting homeless students at the building level. This expands the liaison's capacity, ensures students' rights, and reduces disruptions.
 - i. **residency requirements:** Districts may offer residency affidavits to be completed by host families in doubled up situations. While helpful, districts are reminded that a child may *not* be held out of school while an affidavit is being obtained or if the host refuses to complete one.
 - ii. **lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation:** (RECORDS- Any record ordinarily kept by the school, including immunization or medical records, academic records, birth certificates, guardianship records, and evaluations for special services or programs, regarding each homeless child or youth shall be maintained—(a) so that the records are available, in a timely fashion, when a child or youth enters a new school or school district; and (b) in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions

Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

- A. School to school transfer of records has expedited appropriate placement of students with the services they need, particularly when the transfer of records complements discussions with parents about a student's needs.
- B. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) program serves as a third party conduit for the transfer of records in severe domestic violence cases and the state coordinator on many occasions has reached out to counterparts in other states to facilitate the transfer of records across state lines.
- C. All students must be enrolled immediately regardless of presenting for enrollment without documentation. A memorandum regarding the school's duty to immediately enroll is sent to principals and superintendents annually.

iii. guardianship issues:

- A. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) has developed a caregiver form that establishes the responsibilities of caregivers and requests their contact information to replace traditional proof of guardianship. This form should be crafted carefully so it does not create further barriers or delay school enrollment.
- B. The U.S. Department of Education's Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program Non-Regulatory Guidance suggests using "caretaker affidavits, enrollment forms for unaccompanied youth, and other forms [that] replace typical proof of guardianship" to facilitate immediate enrollment.
- C. Review and revise LEA policies that may serve as a barrier to immediate enrollment for unaccompanied youth.
- D. Ensure that enrollment staff at all district schools understand the rights of unaccompanied youth and are familiar with the policies and procedures for immediate enrollment of these students.
- E. Contact parents or legal guardians, when appropriate, to clarify their relationship with the caregiver and what authority they wish them to exercise.

iv. uniform or dress code requirements:

- A. The homeless liaison assists homeless students with school uniform requirements. Indiana law allows school boards to have school uniform or dress code policies if they are necessary to maintain order or to prevent the endangerment of student health and safety. If a school has uniforms, it must assist low-income families in obtaining the uniforms and in helping students to comply with the dress code policy.
- B. Collaborate with community-based and public agencies to provide homeless students with school uniforms to ensure that an inability to purchase a school uniform does not create an enrollment barrier.

Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth has developed, and periodically reviews and revises, policies designed to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth and ensure enrollment and retention of these students in schools. The following represent activities of the SEA and LEA to serve homeless children and youth:

- Train all school enrollment and administrative staff, counselors, school social workers, and school leaders on the legal requirements regarding immediate enrollment;
- Develop affidavits of residence or other forms to replace typical proof of residency. Such forms should be carefully crafted so that they do not create further barriers or delay enrollment;
- Develop caregiver affidavits, enrollment forms for unaccompanied youth, and other forms to replace typical proof of guardianship. Again, such forms should be carefully crafted so they do not create further barriers or delay enrollment;
- Establish school-based immunization clinics or other opportunities for on-site immunizations;

- Accept school records directly from families and youth;
- Develop short diagnostic assessments to place students immediately while awaiting complete academic records;
- Inform families and youth, in a language they can understand or in an accessible format for individuals with disabilities, as appropriate, of their right to attend either their school of origin or local school;
- Develop clear, understandable, and accessible forms for written explanations of decisions and the right to appeal;
- Expeditiously follow up on any special education and language assistance referrals or services;
- Utilize online services such as vital records office websites that provide birth certificates and State health records databases for proof of immunization (this is preferred to re-immunizing students who do not have records readily available);
- While waiting on official school records, have informational conversations with parents and youth, as well as teachers and staff at the student's previous school to find out a little about the student so that academic services can be put in place immediately;
- When a student dis-enrolls, assemble a portfolio of information and samples of schoolwork in a folder that the parent or student can show upon enrollment in the new school;
- The homeless liaison must assist homeless students in getting school fees waived. Schools often charge students and families significant fees that youth who are homeless are not able to afford. These include graduation fees, lab fees, field trips fees and expenses for participating in activities. In Indiana, school fees should be waived for students who are eligible for free breakfast or lunch. Students who are homeless are automatically eligible for free breakfast or lunch and, therefore, should have their fees waived.
- The homeless liaison assists homeless students with school uniform requirements. Indiana law allows school boards to have school uniform or dress code policies if they are necessary to maintain order or to prevent the endangerment of student health and safety. If a school has uniforms, it must assist low-income families in obtaining the uniforms and in helping students to comply with the dress code policy.

Assistance from Counselors (722(g)(1)(K)): A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) program continues to ensure homeless youth FAFSA applications and verification of their homelessness. In addition, through both internal and external collaboration, The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) has sought to expand support prior to secondary graduation, through the transition to and graduation from post-secondary education. Strategies to ensure, as defined in section 725(2), that homeless students are provided with equal access to college and career counseling and completion assistance include the following.

- A. **Graduation Plan:** Indiana Statute (IC 20-30-4) requires all students, in consultation with the School Counselor and parent, to develop a Graduation Plan in grade 6 and to then further develop the plan in grade 9 and every year thereafter until the student graduates from high school. This plan must include subject and skill areas of interest to the student and a program of study to match such interests and assessments taken.
- B. **Counseling:**
 - a. Article 4 (511 IAC 4-1.5), the Student Services Rule in Indiana, requires student assistance services at the elementary and secondary levels. Student assistance services, coordinated by school counselors, school psychologists, or masters level school social workers, are defined as those services that prevent or alleviate problems that interfere with student learning and include prevention, assessment, intervention (counseling), and

referral.

- b. Article 4 (511 IAC 4-1.5) also requires educational and career services at the secondary level, which shall be coordinated by a school counselor and include admission and orientation; study skills and tutoring; achievement testing; advising and scheduling; career education, assessment, planning; and placement.
- C. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) state coordinator has built awareness of unaccompanied youth, their needs, and is piloting programs and services to address those needs.
- D. The Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY) state coordinator has provided guidance to higher education administrators, admissions, financial aid officers and staff together with homeless liaisons, high school guidance counselors, local providers and child welfare to expand awareness of the growing population of homeless youth transitioning to higher education, their unique needs for housing, food, and support, and the abyss they fall into when those needs are not met.

The Indiana Department of Education, through the Indiana Education for Homeless Children & Youth (INEHCY), strives to ensure educational access and stability of homeless children and youth through building awareness, increased identification, policy revision, public notice of educational rights, and equal access to comparable services. Strategies to accomplish this include training, outreach, technical assistance and guidance, monitoring and intra- and interagency coordination and collaboration with a broad array of stakeholders.

Consolidated State Plan Assurances

Instructions: Each SEA submitting a consolidated State plan must review the assurances below and demonstrate agreement by selecting the boxes provided.

- ☒ **Coordination.** The SEA must assure that it coordinated its plans for administering the included programs, other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
- ☒ **Challenging academic standards and academic assessments.** The SEA must assure that the State will meet the standards and assessments requirements of sections 1111(b)(1)(A)-(F) and 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA and applicable regulations.
- ☒ **State support and improvement for low performing schools.** The SEA must assure that it will approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans consistent with requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v) and (vi) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(e).
- ☒ **Participation by private school children and teachers.** The SEA must assure that it will meet the requirements of sections 1117 and 8501 of the ESEA regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.
- ☒ **Appropriate identification of children with disabilities.** The SEA must assure that it has policies and procedures in effect regarding the appropriate identification of children with disabilities consistent with the child find and evaluation requirements in section 612(a)(3) and (a)(7) of the IDEA, respectively.
- ☒ **Ensuring equitable access to Federal programs.** The SEA must assure that, consistent with section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), it described the steps the SEA will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs as addressed in sections described below (e.g., 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools, 5.3 Educator Equity).

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX LETTER	PAGE NUMBER	DOCUMENT TITLE
A	146	Measurements of Interim Progress
B	149	Notices of Public Meetings for ESSA Community Meetings
C	158	ESSA Community Meetings Findings Summary
D	162	Technical Assistance Working Group Members
E	164	Survey Stakeholder Feedback
F	168	Educator Equity Differences in Rates Tables

APPENDIX A: MEASUREMENTS OF INTERIM PROGRESS

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (except that measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency must only be described for English learners), consistent with the State's minimum number of students. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower-achieving or graduating at lower rates, respectively.

A. Academic Achievement

Grades 3-8 English Language Arts (Public School Students who were enrolled 90% of the school year)

Student Group	Actual Pass Percentages										Goal Pass Percentages (Decrease “Did Not Pass” rate by half)							
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	
All Students	76.9	78.9	79.7	80.1	81.3	67.8	66.4	68.8	71.2	47.9	51.6	55.4	59.1	62.8	66.6	70.3	74.0	
American Indian	74.0	74.8	76.1	75.9	77.5	63.1	64.4	66.9	69.5	44.0	48.0	52.0	56.0	60.0	64.0	68.0	72.0	
Asian		83.0	83.6	84.2	85.7	79.3	78.4	80.0	81.5	63.8	66.4	70.0	71.6	74.2	76.8	79.3	81.9	
Black	58.6	60.8	62.9	63.6	65.2	47.4	45.2	49.1	53.0	24.7	30.1	35.5	40.9	46.3	51.7	57.0	62.4	
Hispanic	64.5	68.5	69.9	70.2	72.6	56.2	54.3	57.6	60.9	35.5	40.0	44.4	48.9	53.4	57.9	62.3	66.8	
Multiracial	74.9	76.1	77.7	78.3	80.2	65.1	63.6	66.2	68.8	43.3	47.4	51.4	55.5	59.5	63.6	67.7	71.7	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		84.2	79.2	80.7	78.6	66.8	59.7	62.6	65.5	42.4	46.5	50.6	54.7	58.8	63.0	67.1	71.2	
White	80.8	82.9	83.4	83.8	84.9	72.6	71.6	73.6	75.7	54.2	57.5	60.7	64.0	67.3	70.6	73.8	77.1	
Special Education	43.3	48.1	49.7	49.9	50.7	29.0	28.7	33.8	38.9	15.7	21.7	27.8	33.8	39.8	45.9	51.9	57.9	
Free/Reduced price meals	66.1	68.9	70.3	70.9	72.7	55.5	53.8	57.1	60.4	33.5	38.3	43.0	47.8	52.5	57.3	62.1	66.8	
English learners							55.0	58.2	61.4	16.3	22.3	28.3	34.3	40.3	46.3	52.2	58.2	

Grades 3-8 Mathematics (Public School Students who were enrolled 90% of the school year)

Student Group	Actual Pass Percentages										Goal Pass Percentages (Decrease “Did Not Pass” rate by half)							
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	
All Students	78.9	80.6	82.0	83.9	84.4	62.0	59.8	62.6	65.5	47.8	51.5	55.3	59.0	62.7	66.5	70.2	73.9	
American Indian	74.9	77.5	78.4	80.2	82.0	57.0	56.2	59.3	62.5	42.9	47.0	51.1	55.2	59.3	63.4	67.4	71.5	
Asian		88.0	88.4	90.1	91.2	78.5	77.0	78.7	80.3	67.9	70.2	72.5	74.8	77.1	79.4	81.7	84.0	
Black	57.7	59.3	62.5	65.7	67.0	37.6	34.7	39.3	44.0	22.5	28.0	33.6	39.1	44.7	50.2	55.8	61.3	
Hispanic	69.5	71.5	73.8	76.2	77.0	50.3	47.7	51.4	55.2	34.4	39.1	43.8	48.5	53.2	57.9	62.5	67.2	
Multiracial	74.5	76.3	78.0	80.5	81.9	57.0	54.4	57.7	60.9	41.7	45.9	50.0	54.2	58.4	62.6	66.2	70.9	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander																		
		84.7	83.0	83.6	83.2	62.6	59.0	61.9	64.9	46.1	50.0	53.8	57.7	61.5	65.4	69.3	73.1	
White	83.0	84.9	85.9	87.6	88.1	67.4	65.6	68.0	70.5	54.6	57.8	61.1	64.3	67.6	70.8	74.0	77.3	
Special	53.4	58.0	59.9	62.2	62.5	30.5	29.8	34.8	39.8	19.3	25.1	30.8	36.6	42.4	48.2	53.9	59.7	

Education																	
Free/Reduced price meals	68.54	70.89	72.96	75.67	76.67	48.83	46.23	50.07	53.91	33.4	38.2	42.9	47.7	52.4	57.2	62.0	66.7
English learners							51.20	54.69	58.17	23.5	29.0	34.4	39.9	45.4	50.9	56.3	61.8

Grade 10 English Language Arts (Public School Students who were enrolled 90% of the school year)								
Student Group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
All	59.23	62.14	65.05	67.96	70.87	73.78	76.69	79.60
American Indian	58.38	61.35	64.32	67.29	70.26	73.23	76.20	79.17
Asian	67.40	69.73	72.06	74.39	76.72	79.05	81.38	83.71
Black	36.72	41.24	45.76	50.28	54.80	59.32	63.84	68.36
Hispanic	46.67	50.48	54.29	58.10	61.91	65.72	69.53	73.34
Multiracial	56.93	60.01	63.09	66.17	69.25	72.33	75.41	78.49
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	50.00	53.57	57.14	60.71	64.28	67.85	71.42	74.99
White	63.91	66.49	69.07	71.65	74.23	76.81	79.39	81.97
Special Ed	16.94	22.87	28.80	34.73	40.66	46.59	52.52	58.45
Free/Reduced Lunch	43.87	47.88	51.89	55.90	59.91	63.92	67.93	71.94
English learners	45.74	49.62	53.50	57.38	61.26	65.14	69.02	72.90

Grade 10 Mathematics (Public School Students who were enrolled 90% of the school year)								
Student Group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
All	34.72	39.38	44.04	48.70	53.36	58.02	62.68	67.34
American Indian	28.42	33.53	38.64	43.75	48.86	53.97	59.08	64.19
Asian	59.21	62.12	65.03	67.94	70.85	73.76	76.67	79.58
Black	13.35	19.54	25.73	31.92	38.11	44.30	50.49	56.68
Hispanic	21.57	27.17	32.77	38.37	43.97	49.57	55.17	60.77
Multiracial	29.84	34.85	39.86	44.87	49.88	54.89	59.90	64.91
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	23.40	28.87	34.34	39.81	45.28	50.75	56.22	61.69
White	38.99	43.35	47.71	52.07	56.43	60.79	65.15	69.51
Special Ed	7.79	14.38	20.97	27.56	34.15	40.74	47.33	53.92
Free/Reduced Lunch	19.65	25.39	31.13	36.87	42.61	48.35	54.09	59.83
English learners	26.68	31.92	37.16	42.40	47.64	52.88	58.12	63.36

B. Graduation Rates

Student Group	Overall Graduation Rate				
	Current Graduation Rate	Graduation Rates to reach Goal			
	2018 Cohort	2019 Cohort	2020 Cohort	2021 Cohort	2022 Cohort
Overall Graduation Rate	87.1	88.7	90.4	92.0	93.6
American Indian	82.4	84.6	86.8	89.0	91.2
Asian	94.8	95.5	96.1	96.8	97.4
Black	78.1	80.8	83.6	86.3	89.1
Hispanic	83.2	85.3	87.4	89.5	91.6
Multiracial	83.9	85.9	87.9	89.9	92.0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	81.9	84.2	86.4	88.7	91.0
White	89.4	90.7	92.1	93.4	94.7
Special Education	72.2	76.1	79.5	82.9	86.4
Free/Reduced price meals	83.4	85.5	87.6	89.6	91.7
English learners	67.7	71.7	75.8	79.8	83.9

C. English Language Proficiency

Student Group	Current Exit Rate (%)	Adequate Growth Rates to reach Goal of English Learners who Exit within Six Years of Initial Identification (%)					
	2018	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
English Learners Performance on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0	5.6% of students attained English proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs	39.0%	45.2%	51.4%	57.6%	63.8%	70.0%

Indiana's goal is for 70.0 percent of English learners to attain English language proficiency within six years. The alignment of this goal with the English Language Proficiency indicator of the State's accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows schools to monitor this student group annually within the six-year timeline of the State's long-term goal.

The WIDA Consortium recently conducted a scoring standard setting for the WIDA ACCESS for ELs 2.0 assessment. Indiana has only administered the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment for two years, and therefore does not have longitudinal data to confidently and securely determine the statewide goal and timeline for the attainment of English language proficiency for its English learner population. As such, Indiana will revisit the 70.0 percent threshold and the six-year timeline as more years of data become available to ensure that the goal is sufficiently rigorous and achievable.

APPENDIX B: NOTICES OF PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR ESSA COMMUNITY MEETINGS

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Thursday, March 16, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. CT

Where: Evansville
Evansville-Vanderburgh Library – North Park Branch
960 Koehler Drive
Evansville, IN 47710

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. CT

**Where: Merrillville
Merrillville Branch of the Lake County Public Library
1919 81st Avenue
Merrillville, IN 46410**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Monday, April 3, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Kokomo
Indiana University-Kokomo
2300 S Washington Street
Kokomo, IN 46902**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Indianapolis
Indianapolis Urban League
777 Indiana Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46202**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Thursday, April 6, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. ET

**Where: New Albany
Griffin Recreation Center
1140 Griffin St.
New Albany, IN 47150**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Goshen
Goshen College
1700 South Main Street
Goshen, IN 46526**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Richmond
 Morrisson-Reeves Library
 80 North 6th Street
 Richmond, IN 47374**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Lafayette
 Tippecanoe County Public Library
 627 South Street
 Lafayette, IN 47901**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

**NOTICE OF COMMUNITY MEETING
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT**

A community meeting will be held by the Indiana Department of Education on:

When: Thursday, April 20, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. ET

**Where: Fort Wayne
Fort Wayne Urban League
2135 Hannah Street
Fort Wayne, IN 46803**

Subject: The Federal Law, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This is a meeting to allow public conversations with opportunities to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback throughout the development of Indiana's plans and policies related to ESSA implementation as well as throughout the implementation of the law.

Pursuant to the Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, any individual interested in attending the hearing who may also require an accommodation should contact Patrick McAlister and advise what accommodation is needed. For more information, contact Patrick McAlister at pmcalister@doe.in.gov

APPENDIX C: ESSA COMMUNITY MEETINGS FINDINGS SUMMARY

ESSA Community Meeting Findings Summary

Introduction

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) created a draft of Indiana's state plan in response to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), a bipartisan law passed by a Republican-majority Congress and signed by a Democratic president. To gather feedback from as many stakeholders as possible, IDOE held community meetings throughout the state.

The community meetings were an integral part of the process, providing a myriad of perspectives and suggestions. Over the course of four months, IDOE hosted 9 community meetings, one in each congressional district. Community meetings were attended by 350+ participants, including teachers, parents, school and district administrators, community leaders, and civil rights advocates.

Community Meeting Structure

The Indiana Department of Education wanted to incorporate the community's voice on three topics: School Accountability, Supporting Students, and School Improvement. The community meetings were conducted with a collaborative structure, directing participants to work in groups and offer suggestions aimed at problem-solving the four key questions. The key questions asked were:

1. How can we determine how our schools are doing?
2. How should we communicate how our schools are doing?
3. How should we support ALL students?
4. How can we improve our schools in need?

Meetings were 90 minutes long with remarks from Dr. Jennifer McCormick, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Patrick McAlister, Director of Policy. They briefed the audience on ESSA and the state's timeline for creating the plan. During the meetings, participants were asked to select one of the small working groups based on their key question of greatest interest. With assistance from a facilitator, participants considered the key question and offered suggestions for IDOE to consider during the creation of the state plan.

State officials were also on-hand at every meeting to listen to feedback from the small groups. Members of the Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) attended at least one meeting each. Staff members from the IDOE and the INSBOE were also present to hear ideas and perspectives.

The working groups spent 30 minutes discussing the topic and creating a list of suggestions. Participants also identified a group reporter who would share their suggestions with other participants. Group reporters presented their group findings for 3-5 minutes. Following the community meetings, IDOE compiled the group presentation feedback for analysis and consideration.

Findings

How can we determine how our schools are doing?

The majority of participants wanted schools to be graded on multiple measures. Academic growth was the most popular among the measures cited, followed by a survey of school

culture and climate. Items referenced most frequently are bolded.

Suggested Measures to Use in Accountability Model
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth measures • Graduation rate • Nationally normed tests to assess academic achievement • Surveys of community, students, parents • Soft skills – social/emotional (rubrics, portfolios, AdvancEd) • School climate and culture survey (and plan of action) • Suspension, chronic absenteeism/attendance, tardiness, discipline referrals • Post-graduation measures including career readiness and work-based learning

How should we communicate how our schools are doing?

Participants also provided insight on the best way IDOE could communicate how schools are doing to the community. Participants suggested improvements on how information is distributed as well as reframing the terms used. Items referenced most frequently are bolded.

Suggested Improvements	Means of Communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDOE reframe education language to positives rather than negatives • Focus on school growth and improvement • Involve the community; develop partnerships between schools and community • Bilingual communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dashboards like IDOE Compass • Extended report cards to include school and district • Reports on other regions for comparison • Community involvement • Other systems like mobile applications and social media

How should we support ALL students?

Supporting the socio-emotional needs of students was a frequently cited area of concern. Many attendees felt as though the social and emotional support piece in schools was currently missing from our state and local levels. The primary conclusion reflected teachers and students should have a solid foundation for social and emotional learning. The action items were broken into 3 groups: teachers and staff, school and district, and IDOE. Items referenced frequently are bolded.

School and District	IDOE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use funding for mental health or socio-emotional needs • Reduce outsourcing of students to external programs; keep in the school • Provide wrap-around services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide categorized funding for mental health or socio-emotional needs • Increase access to social and emotional curriculum or resources
Teachers and Staff	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More complete trainings for teachers in mental health • More complete trainings for teachers about different student groups • More complete trainings for intentional and meaningful use of technology 	

- Identified team of support: social workers, counselors, psychologists, nurses
- Peer-to-peer observations/feedback
- Encourage teachers to build meaningful relationships with students

Supporting students through involvement of parents and families was identified as a critically important need. Better support for families could include making data available regarding transition periods (pre-K to kindergarten, elementary to secondary, middle to high school, high school to post-graduation) readily available for parents. It was also suggested the IDOE increase parent trainings and resources for student-centered academic and career supports.

How can we improve our schools in need?

Suggestions for improving schools in need fell neatly into four categories of responsibilities: IDOE, Local Education Agencies (LEA), teachers, and parents/communities. The most effective way to implement these interventions was either by or through these agencies. Items referenced most frequently are bolded.

IDOE	Schools and Districts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a “pause” in accountability to allow schools to implement changes • Fluid supports based on needs of buildings (and LEAs) • Increase supports in early childhood education • More complex rubric for school success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide wrap-around services • Reduce class size • Extend school day/year; alternate vacation schedule • Hiring Latinx, Spanish-speaking staff so students have role models that look like them
Teachers	Community
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bring back ½ days of professional development ○ Use train-the-trainers model • Instruction Coaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased morale through increased pay and sense of being valued ○ Increase teacher retention • Use tiered evaluation system for new teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship established between districts and community • Literacy and English classes offered to parents

The desire for additional funding was the most popular suggestion from the community meetings. There were significant differences in how participants believed the money should be used. Below are some of the suggestions for use of additional funding to support schools in need. No one answer was referenced more than another and thus none are bolded.

- Preschool
- Funding toward meals, social skills, school counseling, parent education
- Extra funding assistance for subject-based interventions and support

- Evaluate funding formulas; provide an individualized formula that takes various factors into consideration; such as, students' socioeconomic status and specific services based on needs

Other Promising Practices

These community meetings not only allowed IDOE to hear what participants wanted to see in the ESSA plan but also what changes they would like to see in education overall. The majority of their suggestions fell into 5 groups.

Preschool	College and Career Readiness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool for all, ages 3 years to 3rd grade • Bridging gap between early childhood and elementary education • Support for families with students transitioning from preschool to elementary • Tracking student performance from preschool • Increased funding in early childhood education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring students' enrollment in dual credit classes • Measuring career readiness • Training educators of gifted students • Career and technology education supports for all students • Identifying ELL students for gifted or advanced placement classes
Literacy	STEM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts building relationships with parents through literacy and English classes • Additional funding assistance for subject-based interventions and support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awarding points for STEM educators • Supporting students with technology • Equitable access and funding for technology • Training for intentional/meaningful use of technology
Career and Technical Education	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring post-graduation enrollment in work-based learning • Measuring Career and Technical Education course enrollment • Measuring workplace certification offered in schools 	

APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Accountability Technical Assistance Working Group Members	
Name	Organization
PJ McGrew	Office of Governor Eric Holcomb
David Freitas	Indiana State Board of Education; Indiana University-South Bend
Maryanne McMahon	Indiana State Board of Education; Avon Community Schools
Cari Whicker	Indiana State Board Education; Southern Wells Elementary School
Wendy Robinson	Fort Wayne Community Schools
Jenny Froehle	Educational Consultant/Writer
Jamie Garwood	Ball State University Office of Charter Schools
Emanuel Harper	Riverside High School
Robert Lugo	North Elementary School
Hardy Murphy	Indiana Urban Schools Association
LaMeca Perkins-Knight	Theodore Potter School 74
Steve Baker	Indiana Association of School Principals; Bluffton High School
Ric Frataccia	Valparaiso Community Schools
Cynthia Roach	Indiana State Board of Education
Maggie Paino	Indiana Department of Education
Brenda Erbse	Indiana Department of Education

Assessments Technical Assistance Working Group	
Name	Organization
Wes Bruce	Indiana Department of Education
Todd Bess	Indiana Association of School Principals
Cynthia Roach	Indiana State Board of Education
Melissa Collins	Washington Irving School 14; ISTEP Replacement Panel
Byron Ernest	Indiana State Board of Education
John O'Neal	Indiana State Teachers Association
Jeff Butts	Wayne Township Schools
Jessica Carlson	Garrett Middle School
Jean Russell	Southwest Allen County Schools; ISTEP Replacement Panel
Scot Croner	Wa-Nee Community Schools
Tami Geltmaker	South Harrison Community Schools
Charity Flores	Indiana Department of Education
Kristine David	Indiana Department of Education

Supporting Excellent Educators Technical Assistance Working Group	
Name	Organization
Taylor Brown	Indianapolis Public Schools
Lisa Cook	Decatur Township Schools
Mary Gardner	Stand for Children
Mikayla Koharchik	Zionsville Middle School
Liz Martin	Goshen Middle School
Amar Patel	Teach for America Indianapolis
Sarah Pies	CELL at Indiana University
Jim Snapp	Brownsburg Community Schools

Dave Strouse	Batesville Middle School
Steve Thalheimer	Fairfield Community Schools
Caitlin Beatson	Indiana Department of Education
Scott Syverson	Indiana Department of Education

Supporting All Students Technical Assistance Working Group	
Name	Organization
Andrea Korreck	Perry Township Schools
Chris Rauscher	American Institutes for Research
Carole Craig	formerly of the NAACP
Shawnta Barnes	Indianapolis Public Schools
Jessica Ramirez	Elkhart Community Schools; Indiana State Teachers Association
Rick Matysak	American Federation of Teachers Indiana
Fundi Wright	parent, Bartholomew Schools
Nancy Holsapple	Old National Trail Special Services
Mark Russell	Indianapolis Urban League
Jeff Butts	Wayne Township Schools
Megan Purcell	Purdue University
Julia Cordova-Gurule	South Bend Community Schools
Emily Schwartz-Keirns	Fort Wayne Community Schools
John Elcesser	Indiana Non-Public Education Association
Brandie Oliver	Butler University
Kristen Seward	Purdue University
Nathan Williamson	Indiana Department of Education
Valerie Beard	Indiana Department of Education
Cole Dietrich	Indiana Department of Education
Brenda Martz	Indiana Department of Education
Pam Wright	Indiana Department of Education
Kristan Sievers-Coffer	Indiana Department of Education
Amanda Culhan	Indiana Department of Education
Cathy Danyluk	Indiana Department of Education
Jeff Wittman	Indiana Department of Education
Deepali Jani	Indiana Department of Education
Jolene Bracale	Indiana Department of Education

APPENDIX E: SURVEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

The Indiana Department of Education released the state’s draft ESSA plan on June 30th, 2017. We are grateful to all Hoosiers who provided input during the public comment period, as well as those who shared their feedback during the town halls and work group meetings.

The majority of survey respondents were teachers, community members, parents, or district leaders.	Total Survey Respondents	Accountability and School Improvement	Supporting Excellent Educators	Supporting All Students
	523	314	105	104

The Department received feedback acknowledging some of the strengths of the plan, such as establishing the long-term goals to close achievement gaps, offering the state assessment in multiple languages and emphasizing social emotional support for all students. There were also questions about measuring growth for students with disabilities and English language learners, the next steps related to exploring the school culture and climate index, and resources for additional librarians. In some instances, we received feedback on areas that are outside the scope of ESSA or unaligned to ESSA requirements. The following represents the major themes in feedback we received throughout the ESSA planning process.

Assessments and Accountability

Many respondents acknowledged the need for assessments, while emphasizing the importance of a well-rounded education. Top concerns (written responses) regarding statewide assessments included high school math assessments, time spent on testing, and assessment accessibility for English learners.

Applicable Math	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Many stakeholders are interested in assessments focused on real-world math (e.g. finances) rather than an Algebra I end-of-course assessmentStakeholders have questions about the implementation of advanced math coursework and assessments for middle school students
Reduce Testing Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Numerous stakeholders want testing time to be reduced
Equitable Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none">For the most part, stakeholders appreciated the fact that state assessments would be available in multiple languages, however more clarification is needed about the details and purpose of this service

Based on written responses, stakeholders support the proposed accountability metrics, though there are some concerns with the feasibility of reaching the 2023 goals outlined in the plan.

Accountability Metrics Feedback

Closing Achievement Gaps

- Although there were disagreements about how to get there, all stakeholders supported the emphasis placed on closing achievement gaps for historically underserved students

Growth Model

- While some think the 50% gap closure goal is unrealistic (too high), others believe it is not ambitious enough
- Some respondents are looking for more to be done on the growth model for students with disabilities

Graduation Rates

- There were questions and concerns about how the General Diploma will factor into graduation rates
- Similar to the growth model, some stakeholders thought the proposed graduation goals were too high, while others thought it was too low

How will Indiana meet the accountability goals?

In general, stakeholders appreciated the 2023 student achievement goals, the growth model of measurement, and the focus on closing achievement gaps. However, many stakeholders expressed concern with how Indiana plans on reaching these goals with the current statewide funding system: “Targeted groups that need more growth to close the gap will also need more funding.”

In terms of measuring school progress, stakeholders were asked, “**To what extent does this approach [indicator] align with Indiana’s guiding principles?**” The majority of respondents believe the English Language Proficiency and Chronic Absenteeism indicators generally or completely align with Indiana's guiding principles.

Accountability Indicators

Indicator	Alignment to Indiana’s guiding principles	Should K-Grade 2 be included in metric?	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Language Proficiency: Student growth on the WIDA 2.0 assessment will be the basis of this domain measure 	✓	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72% said indicator generally or completely aligned 54% did not think K-Grade 2 should be included
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chronic Absenteeism: The overall goal is for each school to have at least 50% of its student body meeting the definition of a model attendee 	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72% said it generally or completely aligned 53% said indicator should be expanded to K-Grade 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Culture and Climate: Indiana will work with stakeholders to develop a proposal for this indicator by summer of 2018 	✗	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 34% said it was generally or completely aligned

School Improvement

Stakeholders were asked to select the top three types of support the Department should prioritize providing to districts and schools from the following list: (1) Provide technical assistance; (2) Develop an approved list of evidence-based strategies; (3) Create opportunities to network with other districts; (4) Provide professional development opportunities aligned to school/district needs; (5) Other- please explain.


Top three types of support the department should prioritize providing to districts and schools:

- 1 Professional Development
- 2 Other
- 3 Evidenced-Based Strategies

Three themes emerged from the 'Other' category:

- Support for certified librarians
- Financial resources for low performing schools in form of PD as well as wraparound services
- Supporting low performing schools and grants for innovative teaching

When asked about how many years a school should have before shifting to comprehensive support, 71% of respondents selected two or three years.



**N-size = 78. The majority of respondents selected 1-6 years; Zero respondents selected 7-9 years, one respondent selected 10 years*

Supporting Excellent Educators

Stakeholders were asked to select teacher recruitment, preparation and induction strategies they believed to be most effective.

Stakeholders shared recommendations on supporting teacher recruitment and retention efforts.

Teacher Recruitment

- 42% of respondents believe Indiana should implement and sustain a Recruitment and Retention Campaign focused on reframing the public narrative around being a teacher in the state

Teacher Preparation

- Many respondents advocated for partnerships with higher education institutions to ensure high quality teacher candidates
- By far, teachers and school leaders felt that an extended residency experience is essential to developing successful and culturally competent teachers

Teacher Induction

- 78% believe new teachers need more individualized support and mentorship from a qualified teacher who understands the local context

Supporting All Students

While there were several areas where stakeholders felt the needs of all students were met, there were other areas of the plan stakeholders identified as needing more explicit detail regarding the types of supports students will receive.

Strengths

There were several areas that stakeholders felt that the ESSA plan adequately addresses:

- Meeting the unique educational needs of **migratory children** through Title I-C, including the coordination of services and the use of funds
- Supporting **out of school learning time** through the use of Title IV-B, 21st Century Schools
- Supporting **homeless children and youth** through the use of Title VII-B, McKinney-Vento

More Information Needed

There were also areas that the some stakeholders wanted the ESSA plan to address in greater detail:

- Meeting the unique needs of **English learners**, including common entrance and exit procedures, state support, monitoring, and technical assistance
- Providing **student support and academic enrichment** through the use of Title IV-A
- Supporting **rural and low income schools** through the use of Title V-B Rural and Low-Income School Program

APPENDIX F: EDUCATOR EQUITY DIFFERENCES IN RATES

Instructions: Each SEA must complete the appropriate table(s) below. Each SEA calculating and reporting student-level data must complete, at a minimum, the table under the header “Differences in Rates Calculated Using Student-Level Data”.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

Student Category	<i>Ineffective</i> Teacher Rate	Disproportionality
Low-income students	0.37%	3.7
Non-low-income students	0.10%	
Minority students	0.85%	8.5
Non-minority students	0.10%	

Student Category	<i>Out-of-field</i> Teacher Rate	Disproportionality
Low-income students	2.48%	1.15
Non-low-income students	2.15%	
Minority students	2.84%	1.15
Non-minority students	2.46%	

Student Category	<i>Inexperienced</i> teacher rate	Disproportionality
Low-income students	12.35%	1.54
Non-low-income students	8.02%	
Minority students	13.77%	1.63
Non-minority students	8.47%	

Student Category	<i>Excellent Educator</i> Rate	Disproportionality
Low-income students	90.26%	.97
Non-low-income students	93.28%	
Minority students	86.88%	.94
Non-minority students	92.91%	